

enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1805. Also, petition of Mrs. Robert T. Tumblston and 1,347 citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1806. Also, petition of Anna McHatton and 20 citizens of Akron, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1807. Also, petition of Mrs. W. L. Jenkins and 26 citizens of Fayetteville, Tenn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1808. Also, petition of S. M. Dunnham, Jr., and 45 citizens of Lynn Haven, Fla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1809. Also, petition of H. W. Berneking and 41 citizens of St. Louis, Mo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1810. Also, petition of Mrs. E. R. Small and 32 citizens of Princeton, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1811. Also, petition of Robert H. Ayers and 63 citizens of Andrews, S. C., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1812. Also, petition of Frances A. DeGraff and 230 citizens of Amsterdam, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1813. Also, petition of Alice G. Moncre and 20 citizens of Richmond, Va., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to re-

duce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1814. Also, petition of Mrs. Lionel Bertrand and 167 citizens of Welsh, La., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1815. Also, petition of Alice Porter and 58 citizens of Allegan, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1816. Also, petition of Ethel I. Swisher and Mary Savage and 75 citizens of Lakewood, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1817. Also, petition of Joey Denton and 20 citizens of Santa Monica, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1818. Also, petition of Mrs. A. G. Nelman and 58 citizens of Portland, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1819. Also, petition of V. E. Jennings and 20 citizens of Buckhannon, W. Va., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1820. By Mr. CARTER: Assembly Joint Resolution No. 26 of the State of California, urging the creation of a Pharmacy Corps in the United States Army and endorsing House bill 997 and urging its enactment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1821. Also, Senate Joint Resolution No. 7 of the State of California, memorializing the Congress to pass the Lea-Weich bill suspending the exemption from tolls in favor of the United States Government traffic over the Golden Gate Bridge during the war period; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1822. Also, petition protesting against the release of Japanese from the relocation centers; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1823. Also, petition of Jennie Price, of Berkeley, Calif., and 40 citizens of Alameda County, urging the enactment of House bill 2082, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1824. Also, petition of Olive B. Jones and 40 other residents of Richmond, Calif., urging the enactment of House bill 2082, the

Bryson bill, prohibiting the sale of alcoholic liquors during the war period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1825. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of Mrs. George G. Foster, of Bryan, Tex., favoring House bill 1192; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1826. By Mr. HOLMES of Washington: Petitions of sundry citizens of Yakima, Dayton, Garfield, Palouse, Selah, Cowiche, Moxee, and Walla Walla to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1827. By the SPEAKER: petition of the Pennsylvania Aeronautics Commission, Department of Commerce, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, petitioning consideration of House bill 1012; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JULY 1, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in times of stillness, as we pause in the midst of rushing cares, we hear like a distant song the call of the better angels of our nature. Forbid that the toil of life or the dust of common days should rob us of life's meaning, its dignity, and its beauty. Save us from the supreme folly of missing Thy glory by turning to grasp for the baubles of vanity with our foolish freedom, our fleeting pleasures, and our fatal self-indulgence.

We hear the low, sad music of humanity as in disrupted and invaded lands men mingle tears with hopeless tasks and days and nights are filled with terror and horror. Even as we brood on the pain and anguish of the world, by faith may we discern a rainbow of hope through the tears of the exploited and the disinherited. May there be redemption in the cross to which by selfish power humanity is nailed. Seeing we spend our days as a tale that is told, let us haste to speak the best that is within us, lest ere ever the day has worn to noon we hear the one clear call before our word is said and our deed is done. May we not neglect or defer it, seeing that we pass this way but once. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, June 30, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1109) to increase by \$400,000,000 the amount authorized to

be appropriated for defense housing under the act of October 14, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2968) making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. PABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TAHER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. DITTER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 2536. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment," approved June 2, 1920, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2869. An act to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2996. An act making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION FOR FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY (S. DOC. NO. 88)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation, fiscal year 1944, in the amount of \$100,000,000 for the Federal Works Agency, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

WAR CONTROL AND REGULATION OF THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC—PETITION

Mr. ANDREWS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Bartow and vicinity, in the State of Florida, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD without all the signatures attached, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

To reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization, we, the undersigned citizens of the State of Florida petition the Congress of the United States to pass H. R. 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina.

Mrs. ANNA D. COBB,
Mrs. MAUD D. RATHBUN,
Mrs. JOHN G. PHILLIPS

(And sundry other citizens of the State of Florida).

RESOLUTION BY DIRECTORS OF GOOSE RIVER (N. DAK.) NATIONAL FARM LOAN ASSOCIATION—FEDERAL LAND BANKS

Mr. LANGER presented a resolution adopted by directors of the Goose River National Farm Loan Association, of Mayville, N. Dak., which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas, the Honorable HAMPTON P. FULMER, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture in the House of Representatives, has introduced a bill, House Resolution 50, to provide for improving the functioning of the cooperative features of the Federal Land Bank System; to relieve Federal land bank borrowers of stock liability; to organize the Federal land banks and the national farm-loan associations as membership corporations, and to provide for placing Federal land banks on a self-supporting basis and for increasing the functions and responsibilities of national farm-loan associations; to establish a method for determining the interest rates on Federal land bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans; to provide for refunding and guaranteeing certain bonds of such banks; to establish a method for adjusting certain agricultural indebtedness; to provide for limiting the taking of deficiency judgments by Federal land banks and by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation; and for other purposes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Directors of the Goose River National Farm Loan Association of Mayville, N. Dak., That the Congress of the United States be respectfully petitioned to act upon and pass the foregoing bill now pending in Congress as expeditiously as possible; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Honorable HAMPTON P. FULMER, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives, Senator GERALD P. NYE, Senator WILLIAM LANGER, Representative Usher L. BURDICK, Representative WILLIAM LEMKE, and the Federal Land Bank of St. Paul, respectively.

FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION—ATTITUDE OF NORTH DAKOTA FARMERS UNION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram from the North Dakota Farmers Union, by Glenn J. Talbott, the State president.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DES MOINES, IOWA, June 25, 1943.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

The Senate should insist upon the appropriation bill it passed for the Farm Security Administration. The Senate loan authorization for rehabilitation of small farmers and putting them into food production was itself too little in view of Bureau of Agricultural Economics data and testimony on production results obtained by small farmers and in view of Allied food requirements. The Allied Nations cannot afford to cast aside any food-production opportunities. Administrative funds must be related to loans outstanding and not to loans to be made or Treasury losses from inadequate servicing of old loans will many times exceed the sums denied for administration.

The House denial of loans to a farmer to permit him to become a member of a cooperative reverses National Government's consistent policy of encouraging farmer cooperatives. Further, the cooperative provision as

well as the restrictions on rehabilitation loans, is an attempt to deny farmers who most need credit the same consideration shown larger prosperous farmers through farm credit system, including land banks, production credit associations, and banks for cooperatives. The effort to cripple Farm Security Administration by restrictions or removal from proved and successful administrators is an effort to wipe out small farmers at a time when the Allied Nations desperately need fullest possible food production and should be crushed like a fifth-column plot. We are advised Food Administration will ask wheat farmers to increase acreage 30 percent or 16,000,000 acres next year. Action just concluded by House singles out and strikes at wheat farmers who produce the only basic crop now below parity. It denies him parity payments. It eliminates his crop insurance. It restricts the added hundred million triple A payment money to soil practice payments so he cannot get 23 cents per bushel from wheat to which parity entitles him. In view of tremendous increase in acreage needed next year, such mayhem on wheat farmers now is insane.

The Senate must not compromise.

NORTH DAKOTA FARMERS UNION,
By GLENN J. TALBOTT.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds:

S. 413. A bill to authorize the President to purchase certain lands in Arlington County, Va.; with amendments (Rept. No. 373).

By Mr. CHANDLER, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 1156. A bill to authorize the disposition of certain property under the jurisdiction of the War Department; with an amendment (Rept. No. 374).

By Mr. STEWART (for Mr. ELLENDER), from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1334. A bill for the relief of J. Frank Meador; with an amendment (Rept. No. 375).

By Mr. MALONEY, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds:

H. R. 2936. A bill to authorize the appropriation of an additional \$200,000,000 to carry out the provisions of title II of the act entitled "An Act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended; with an amendment (Rept. No. 376); and

H. R. 3020. A bill to authorize the use of part of the United States Capitol Grounds east of the Union Station for the parking of motor vehicles; without amendment (Rept. No. 377).

By Mr. MURDOCK, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

S. 275. A bill relating to the administrative jurisdiction of certain public lands in the State of Oregon; with an amendment (Rept. No. 378).

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri, from the Committee on Commerce:

S. 1286. A bill to provide relief to farmers whose property was destroyed or damaged by floods in 1943; with an amendment (Rept. No. 379).

By Mr. DOWNEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 1250. A bill to repeal section 2 of the act approved May 17, 1926, which provides for the forfeiture of pay of persons in the military and naval service of the United States who are absent from duty on account of the direct effects of venereal disease due to misconduct; with an amendment (Rept. No. 380).

DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT RECORDS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Library I report favorably without amendment a small bill authorizing the disposition of certain papers by the Archivist. I ask unanimous consent that it may now be considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill, H. R. 2943, to provide for the disposal of certain records of the United States Government.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SCRUGHAM:

S. 1296. A bill relating to the application of the excess-profits tax to certain production bonus payments; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. LANGER introduced Senate bill 1297, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. 1298. A bill to authorize the appointment of honorably discharged veterans of the armed forces to positions in the Government service without regard to the civil service laws; to the Committee on Civil Service.

CONNECTION OF INTER-AMERICAN AND ALASKAN HIGHWAYS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill to provide for a defense highway in the United States to serve as a link to connect the Inter-American Highway with the Alaskan Highway, and for other purposes. I may say that when the Alaskan Highway was constructed I objected to the way it was being paid for. I objected to the United States Government furnishing all the money to build that highway, which was nearly 1,695 miles long. I object again to the promise made by our Government to Canada that for 2 years after the war we shall maintain this highway without a single dollar of cost to the Dominion of Canada. Inasmuch, however, as the Alaskan Highway has been built, and another highway, the Inter-American Highway, has also been built, I believe that at the earliest possible moment we should connect the two highways by the route proposed in the bill I am introducing.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1297) to provide for a defense highway in the United States to serve as a link in connecting the Inter-American Highway with the Alaskan Highway, and for other purposes, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

FUND FOR ENTERTAINMENT OF DISTINGUISHED VISITORS BY FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I submit a Senate resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 163), as follows:

Resolved, That the unexpended balance of the sum of \$1,000 made available for expenditure from the contingent fund of the Senate under the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 14, Seventy-eighth Congress (accepting an invitation to have delegations from the Senate and the House of Representatives attend a meeting held under the auspices of the Dominion of Canada Branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association), is hereby made available for expenditure during the remainder of the Seventy-eighth Congress for the purpose of enabling the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate to defray the expenses of entertaining as its guests distinguished foreign visitors to the United States. The expenses incurred for such purpose shall be payable upon the submission of vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ACT

Mr. SHIPSTEAD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 164), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Whereas the Rural Electrification Administration was given authority to administer the Rural Electrification Act; and

Whereas rural electrification has been extended rapidly throughout the country for the benefit of farmers; and

Whereas the success of the rural electrification program has been influenced by a policy of encouraging farmers to become members of cooperative groups which, in turn, should be and must be encouraged to become free from political or Government controls as rapidly as possible; and

Whereas Congress, in approving of the Rural Electrification Act, set forth its policy of protecting the Rural Electrification Administration from political influences and political controls; and

Whereas it is now reported that the Department of Agriculture has declared that Rural Electrification Administration cooperatives' funds were taken to promote and finance insurance companies and that this use of such funds is open to serious question; and

Whereas it is now contended, and evidence at hand supports the belief, that groups have been organized and supported from Government funds to engage in activities intended to influence the Congress and other Government agencies and which activities are declared to be in violation of the letter and spirit of the Rural Electrification Act: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture of the United States Senate, or any duly appointed subcommittee thereof, is authorized and instructed to inquire into the administration of the Rural Electrification Act and for the purpose of determining whether political groups or organizations have been created to influence the administration of

the Rural Electrification Act and if so, how they have been organized and how they have been financed, and what efforts they have made to influence the administration of the act, whether the administration of Rural Electrification Administration has not suffered since Rural Electrification Administration was made subject to the Department of Agriculture, and whether Rural Electrification Administration should not be restored to its original status as an independent agency responsible only to the Congress, and whatever other facts are helpful in determining a policy for Rural Electrification Administration which would carry out the original purposes of the Rural Electrification Act.

THE FOOD CRISIS

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, when the Commodity Credit Corporation bill was pending before the Senate yesterday I withheld any observations on the subject because of the pressure of time. I reluctantly voted against the conference report, despite my own belief that the so-called roll-back and price subsidy program are unsound, because I cannot approve, in this emergency, the total prohibition of any anti-inflation experiment unless and until we can produce a sure-fire substitute. I favored and supported the committee recommendation which would have permitted the completion of existing experiments, while restricting their expansion unless and until they prove their worth. No man can be dogmatic in this dilemma and say "This is the way." We must proceed by trial and error. Thus far we have had too much error. But it seems to me that we must all lift our sights to the broader vision of the total responsibility which the total government confronts, in behalf of the whole American people. Therefore, I feel it my duty to make this frank statement to the Senate in connection with the desperate situation which the country confronts in respect particularly to the food crisis. I am doing this as a prelude to asking for the publication in the RECORD of excerpts from an editorial printed in the New York Herald Tribune entitled "A Baruch Committee for Food."

Mr. President, I am profoundly disturbed by the situation which we and the country—and let us never forget the country in this respect—confront as a result of the existing situation. There is a food crisis in America, and it will become increasingly ominous. It can ruin the war effort at home and abroad. Farm production is as basic as munitions production. Food, in this war, is as essential as bullets. Meanwhile, there is also a price and wage crisis in America, and it will increasingly threaten suicidal inflation unless adequately managed.

Why we have been allowed to drift into this hazardous mess by the administration's management of our national economy is a matter of opinion and mostly a post mortem matter. In my own view it is a result, first, of a wrong basis of approach in the original price-control bill, and the failure effectively to gear prices and wages together; the result, second, of confusion and ineptitude and timidity and mismanagement of the system chosen to be pursued; and third,

a total lack of concentrated executive and administrative leadership, with adequate power to deal with the total over-all food problem.

But whatever the reasons, here we are, and the present question is where do we go from here and where does the country go from here.

It seems to me that we find ourselves, speaking of the Government as a whole, in a wholly untenable situation. On the one hand the administration intrenches along one line of battle and clings incorrigibly to a position which the overwhelming sentiment of Congress, and I believe of the country, rejects. Congress, on the other hand, intrenches along another line of battle—a far better line, in my view, I may say—and clings relentlessly to a different pattern which the President and his top-flight "kitchen cabinet" reject. Meanwhile, Mr. Chester Davis, who is probably the most competent War Food Administrator available throughout America for this over-all responsibility, resigns, and is even denied a Presidential interview in this connection, because he substantially differs with the President's administrative pattern and declines longer to carry a responsibility without sufficient power to achieve a synchronized result.

Mr. President, in spite of my complete sympathy with the congressional viewpoint, it seems to me this leaves the Government as a whole, including Congress, in a position of sheer chaos at a moment when chaos must be cleared away before it is too late. Where does it leave the food problem, with Capitol Hill entrenched at one end of an argument and the White House entrenched at the other? Where does it leave the American people? Where does it leave the dire need for increased farm production? Where does it leave the ultimate consumer? Where does it leave the battle against inflation? Where does it leave the Army and the Navy? Where does it leave the united war effort? They are left at the mercy of an unliquidated quarrel within the Government itself.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that some effort must be made somewhere, somehow, to find a clearing house which can create and produce a unified, practical program which can have the reasonable fidelity of both Capitol Hill and the White House, so that we can have action instead of argument. I can see nothing but disaster ahead if we are to continue to be clinched in an impasse. An impasse at home can be just as fatal as an impasse at the battle front.

I do not know the answer, but when the New York Herald Tribune, with whose editorials I occasionally agree, draws a parallel between our previous rubber chaos and the present food chaos, I think the analogy has validity, and when it suggests that a Baruch committee was able to clarify the rubber situation satisfactorily and that this might be a pattern for clarifying the food situation, I am impressed with the importance of exploring such possibilities.

I suppose this situation is primarily in the hands of the President. If there were appointed an adequate Baruch committee—if that can be used as a generic term, without referring in this instance to Mr. Baruch himself—if there were the equivalent of a Baruch committee, composed of men who know, composed of leadership in which the American people have confidence, composed of men who could present a united recommendation to all of us in respect to the composition of our differences and to the course to be pursued, I have a feeling that if something of this sort could be done, it would not only be a benediction but it might well avoid an ultimate crisis, which we simply encourage and fertilize by persistent difference in opinion respecting the proper approach as between Congress on the one hand and the administration on the other.

Therefore, with this preliminary comment, I am asking that excerpts from the New York Herald Tribune editorial entitled "A Baruch Committee for Food" shall be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BARUCH COMMITTEE FOR FOOD

America's new \$700,000,000 rubber industry by the end of this year will be capable of meeting all essential civilian, as well as military, requirements. Manufacturing capacity of the 40 plants throughout the country by December will be in excess of 800,000 tons a year, which is more than the Nation ever consumed before.

These figures are amazing enough standing alone, but they become even more amazing when one recalls that up to a few months ago the country was virtually without a wartime rubber program. We might have been floundering about today had not the President had the good sense to appoint Bernard M. Baruch as head of a committee to consider the various competing rubber production plans, strip the complex controversy of partisan politics and decide upon a definite and consistent course of action.

There is a striking parallel between the chaos which prevailed with respect to rubber at the time the Baruch committee was set up and that which prevails today with respect to food. So contradictory are many of the steps that have been taken to date, so deep is the cleavage regarding the economics of the problem among even the best informed leaders of opinion, and so thoroughly enmeshed in politics has the whole issue become that complete break-down is threatened, if, indeed, it is not already upon us. It is fair to ask whether the time has not come to set up a new Baruch committee to determine which of the several roads advocated should be taken and how our policies in the fields of production, distribution, and consumption can be brought into harmony with that objective.

These are merely typical examples of the cleavages of opinion that prevail on the very fundamentals of wartime food policy. They could be multiplied several times over. Moreover, they represent merely the honest differences among those whose opinions on the question are entitled to respect. They take no account of the politics in which the problem has become so deeply mired, such as the feud between the farmer and organ-

ized labor and the President's thoroughly opportunistic approach to the issue.

The time has come when there must be an end to this pulling and hauling, this jerry-building of food policy. And the best way a new start can be made, in the view of this newspaper, is through the same approach as that taken on the rubber problem. The crying need of the moment is for an intelligent study of the whole problem by a group of disinterested experts who can decide, if not just how we are to get there, at least where we want to go.

EFFECTS OF DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS PROPERTY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TYDINGS

[Mr. HAWKES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Effects of Disposal of Surplus Property," delivered by Senator TYDINGS before the National Chamber of Commerce War Council and thirty-first annual meeting, New York City, April 29, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

REALISM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR REYNOLDS

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Realism," delivered by him on June 30, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF ATTACK ON RUSSIA—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MURRAY

[Mr. RADCLIFFE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator MURRAY at an open-air meeting on the courthouse plaza, Baltimore, Md., on June 22, 1943, on the occasion of the second anniversary of the attack by Hitler on Russia, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY BEFORE REPUBLICAN WOMEN OF APPLETON, WIS.

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator WILEY before a breakfast meeting of Republican women, at the Hotel Conway, Appleton, Wis., on June 27, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

A SENATOR LOOKS AT CONGRESS—ARTICLE BY SENATOR LA FOLLETTE

[Mr. TRUMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "A Senator Looks at Congress," written by Senator LA FOLLETTE, and published in the Atlantic Monthly for July, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY MAJ. GEN. EUGENE REYBOLD BEFORE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY ASSOCIATION

[Mr. TRUMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Maj. Gen. Eugene Reybold, Chief of Engineers, before the Mississippi Valley Association at St. Louis, Mo., on June 28, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE O. P. A.—EDITORIAL FROM THE ST. LOUIS POST DISPATCH

[Mr. TRUMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "In Fairness to OPA," printed in the St. Louis Post Dispatch of June 16, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

PUBLIC OPINION POLLS SUPPORT POST-WAR SOCIAL SECURITY

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD polls from various sources endorsing an expanded social-security program for post-war America, which appear in the Appendix.]

WE MUST FACE THE FACTS ABOUT RUSSIA—ARTICLE BY MAX EASTMAN

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article by Max Eastman, entitled "To Collaborate Successfully We Must Face the Facts About Russia," published in the July 1943 issue of the Reader's Digest, which appears in the Appendix.]

FACTS ABOUT RUSSIA—ANSWER TO ARTICLE BY MAX EASTMAN

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article entitled "Answering Max Eastman," published in PM of July 1, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

SUBSIDIES ARE INFLATION—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON NEWS

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "Subsidies Are Inflation," from the Washington News of July 1, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

JUSTICE TO RETIRED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES—EDITORIAL IN THE BOSTON GLOBE

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "An Admitted Injustice," published in the Boston Globe of May 29, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

LETTER FROM ZYGMUNT ZYGIELBOJM TO PREMIER SIKORSKI OF POLAND

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a letter written by Zygmunt Zygielbojm to Premier Sikorski, of Poland, which appears in the Appendix.]

OUR APPALLING MANPOWER WASTE—ARTICLE FROM THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article entitled "Our Appalling Manpower Waste," from the Christian Science Monitor of June 5, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE FRESH BEEF SITUATION—ARTICLE FROM THE BILLINGS (MONT.) GAZETTE

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a letter from B. L. Surface, of 322 Park Street, Bismarck, N. Dak., enclosing an article from the Billings (Mont.) Gazette entitled "Says Fresh Beef Rots on Tracks," which appears in the Appendix.]

LAWYERS IN THE OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a letter by Thomas I. Emerson, associate general counsel of the Office of Price Administration, printed in the New York Times of June 30, 1943, and his reply thereto, printed in the New York Times of July 1, 1943, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE JOB COLOR LINE IN THE NATION'S CAPITAL

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record two articles from the Socialist Monthly Bulletin of the Washington Local of the Socialist Party, which appear in the Appendix.]

DANGERS IN ANTI-INFLATION DRIVE—ARTICLE BY LEWIS HANEY

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article entitled "Haney Cites Dangers in Anti-Inflation Drive," written by Lewis Haney and pub-

lished in the New York Journal-American of June 29, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

COLONEL RICKENBACKER—ARTICLE FROM PM

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article by Sherrill Hillman, entitled "Rickenbacker Nets \$260,000 in Stock Deal," published in PM of July 1, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF A BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on June 30, 1943, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 217) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to requisition property required for the defense of the United States," approved October 16, 1941, to continue it in effect.

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there is nothing in the form of unfinished business before the Senate. I understood that the conference report on the agricultural appropriation bill was ready, and that the Senator from Georgia desired to have it considered. It will probably take a little time to dispose of it, in view of the motion the Senator contemplates making. I do not like to have the Senate recess for an indefinite period. I understand there will be several speeches on the report.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the majority and minority leaders prefer, we might proceed with the conference report. It would be a little more convenient to have it taken up later in the day, but I can submit the report at the present time.

Mr. BARKLEY. I believe we had better start in on the report, and perhaps we can accommodate ourselves to the Senator from Georgia, who had made arrangements to do something else.

Mr. RUSSELL submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 92.

Amendment numbered 88: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 88, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "Provided, That no part of said appropriation or any other appropriation in this Act shall be used for incentive or production adjustment payments, except for soil conservation and water conservation payments and payment of acreage allotment commitments on commodities as defined in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and as enumerated and set forth in the '1943 Agricultural Conservation Program' bulletin,

dated December 3, 1942"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 98 and 99.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
CARL HAYDEN,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
J. H. BANKHEAD,
E. D. SMITH,
GERALD P. NYE,
CHAS. L. McNARY.

Managers on the part of the Senate.

M. C. TARVER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
ELMER H. WENE,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN.

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. RUSSELL. I move that the conference report be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask the Senator whether we should not have a quorum. No quorum has been called this morning, and I think Senators should be put on notice what is to be taken up.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no objection.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Guffey	Radcliffe
Andrews	Gurney	Reed
Austin	Hawkes	Revercomb
Ball	Hayden	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hill	Robertson
Barkley	Holman	Russell
Bilbo	Johnson, Colo.	Scrugham
Bone	Kilgore	Shipstead
Brewster	La Follette	Smith
Bridges	Langer	Stewart
Brooks	Lodge	Taft
Buck	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Burton	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Butler	McClellan	Tobey
Byrd	McFarland	Truman
Capper	McKellar	Tunnell
Caraway	McNary	Tydings
Chandler	Maloney	Vandenberg
Chavez	Maybank	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Mead	Wagner
Connally	Millikin	Wallgren
Danaher	Moore	Walsh
Davis	Murdock	Wheeler
Downey	Murray	Wherry
Eastland	Nye	White
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Willis
George	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Gerry	Overton	
Green	Pepper	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] are necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the partial conference report which has been submitted deals with the language of the agricultural appropriation bill which provides for the manner of payment of appropriations for soil-conservation and domestic-allotment purposes.

The first amendment amounts to a recession on the part of the House, and permits the payments on the 1943 crop to be made in accordance with the provisions of the announcement by the Secretary of Agriculture as of December 3. In other words, under the bill as it now stands, with the conference report, the Congress and the Government will keep faith with all farmers on the commitments which were made under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act.

The other amendment which was agreed to in conference represents the settlement of a disagreement between the House and the Senate as to the method of allocating the funds for the next crop year, for 1944 crops. The House provision allowed \$300,000,000, and confined it strictly to soil-conservation and water-conservation payments. The Senate likewise limited it to \$300,000,000, but left it in the discretion of the Department of Agriculture as to how the funds were to be applied.

The Senate receded on its amendments, and under the provisions of the conference report \$300,000,000 will be paid next year on a program solely related to soil conservation and water conservation.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, does the conference report contain the crop-insurance item?

Mr. RUSSELL. The crop-insurance matter is in disagreement, and I shall make a motion affecting that matter when the pending motion is disposed of.

Mr. NYE. I shall not address myself to the crop-insurance item until the pending motion is disposed of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
UNITED STATES,
June 30, 1943.
Resolved, That the House still further insist upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 98 and 99 to the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there are still in disagreement between the two bodies amendments Nos. 98 and 99, which relate to the Federal Crop Insurance Act. I have felt very strongly that Federal crop insurance has not had a fair trial. The provisions of the House amendment permit compliance with the contracts of insurance for the year 1943, but prevent entering into any new contracts of crop insurance. The Senate conferees and the conferees on the part of the other body have devoted a great deal of time to discussion of this matter. There has apparently been no time when there was any possibility of the conferees agreeing. The Senate conferees have, therefore, insisted that the matter be taken back to the House for votes on three separate occasions. An effort was made when the bill was before the House in the first instance to restore the appropriation for the Federal Crop Insurance Act for the next year. It was defeated when the bill was originally before the House.

In the other body there have been 3 separate votes at the insistence of the conferees on the part of the Senate. On the first record the vote in the affirmative was 160 and the vote in the negative was 208. When the matter was carried back for a second vote those in the other body who were supporting the position of the Senate to continue the program of crop insurance were unable to secure a record vote in the House, because only 31 Members of the House supported the demand for a record vote. Therefore, the amendment was voted down by a standing vote of approximately 80 to 152. I do not have the exact figures.

We then went back into conference on the matter. The Senate conferees suggested every possible compromise which could be conceived of. The House conferees were adamant in their position that they would not allow any funds whatever to be voted for the purpose of carrying on the program after the end of the current fiscal year. Some statements were made that if no losses were entailed on this year's program it might be possible to get a deficiency appropriation, but no definite agreement was had to that effect.

Yesterday the matter was again voted on in the House. The vote was 135 in favor of the Senate amendments and 223 against them. It was very evident that the measure, instead of gaining in strength in the other body, has been losing ground on each of the four successive votes which have been taken. If there were any possibility on earth, Mr. President, of sustaining the Senate's position I should make a motion that the Senate insist on its amendments so that the conferees would carry the matter back to conference; but I am convinced, from the hours we have labored on the subject, that the House is not at all likely to recede or to accept any reasonable compromise. In the conviction that it is impossible to gain anything by further considering the matter, and realizing the importance of having passed a bill to enable the Department of Agriculture to

function, I move that the Senate recede from its insistence on its amendments numbered 98 and 99.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I desire to ask the Senator a question relative to procedure. The Senate just agreed to the conference report; did it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. Were not the crop-insurance amendments a part of the report?

Mr. RUSSELL. The crop-insurance amendments have never been in any of the reports, because the conferees have never been able to agree on them. We have adopted three partial reports on the bill, but none of them have included the crop-insurance amendments; because the conferees have not been able to agree on them. The amendments on crop insurance are now before the Senate as a separate proposition, for the Senate to deal with as it sees fit.

Mr. LANGER. Is not that unusual?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no; there is nothing unusual about it. The Senate had a record vote on the proposition the other day. The matter was not contained in the conference report. The House conferees had insisted that the Senate take a record vote, and they were not willing to take the matter back to the House until the Senate had a record vote.

Mr. LANGER. I understood we had a record vote; but I thought the matter was contained in the conference report.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is carried in the conference report, but as a matter still in disagreement. The House and Senate still are in disagreement regarding it.

The Senator will understand that in conferences on multitudinous items of a bill, oftentimes there will be three or four or five reports, and the conferees will agree on all the propositions on which they can agree, and include them in the report; but those on which they cannot agree are reported separately to the respective Houses.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I want the RECORD to show that I voted against the conference report.

Mr. RUSSELL. The amendments pertaining to crop insurance are not in the conference report.

Mr. LANGER. I understand that, but I want the RECORD to show I voted against the conference report because the crop-insurance matter is not included in it. That is one of the reasons why I voted against the report.

Mr. RUSSELL. Very well. Of course, the Senator has that right.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator what has been done to the F. S. A.?

Mr. RUSSELL. The appropriations for the F. S. A. were made in full amount for the farm-tenant-purchase program. The amount for loans and grants for rural rehabilitation was reduced from \$97,500,000 to \$60,000,000. The appropriation for the administrative fund was reduced from the Senate figure of \$29,000,000 to \$20,000,000. All that has been

agreed to in a previous conference report.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Have any functions of the agency been transferred to any other agency?

Mr. RUSSELL. Not at all; all are kept together as an entity.

Mr. President, I have moved that the Senate recede from its position on the amendments.

INCREASED AUTHORIZATION FOR DEFENSE HOUSING

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1109) to increase by \$400,000,000 the amount authorized to be appropriated for defense housing under the act of October 14, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 3 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is amended by striking out "\$1,200,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$1,500,000,000."

Sec. 2. That section 3 of said act approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and a further proviso, as follows: "Provided further, That the term 'administrative expenses' as used herein shall be deemed to include administrative expenses of the National Housing Agency in connection with any functions performed by it with respect to priorities or allocations of materials relating to public or private housing for persons engaged in national defense activities."

Sec. 3. That section 303 of said act, approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 303. Moneys derived from rental or operation of property acquired or constructed under the provisions of this act, of Public Laws Nos. 9, 73, and 353, Seventy-seventh Congress, and of section 201 of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941, as amended, shall be available for expenses of operation and maintenance and expenses found necessary in the disposition of any such property or the removal of temporary housing by the Administrator, including the establishment of necessary reserves therefor and administrative expenses in connection therewith: *Provided*, That moneys derived by the Administrator from the rental or operation of any such property may be deposited in a common fund account or accounts in the Treasury: *And provided further*, That except for necessary reserves authorized by this act or by section 201 of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941, as amended, the unobligated balances of the moneys deposited into the Treasury from the rental or operation of such property shall be covered at the end of each fiscal year into miscellaneous receipts."

Sec. 4. That the said act approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end of title III the following new section:

"Sec. 313. The Administrator shall, as promptly as may be practicable and in the public interest, remove all housing under his jurisdiction which is of a temporary character, as determined by him, and constructed under the provisions of this act, Public Law 781, Seventy-sixth Congress, and Public Laws 2, 73, and 353, Seventy-seventh Congress. Such removal shall, in any event, be accomplished not later than 2 years after the President declares that the emergency

declared by him on September 8, 1939, has ceased to exist, with the exception only of such housing as the Administrator, after consultation with local communities finds is still needed in the interest of the orderly demobilization of the war effort: *Provided*, That all such exceptions shall be reexamined annually by the Administrator and that all such exceptions and reexaminations shall be reported to the Congress."

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to increase by \$300,000,000 the amount authorized to be appropriated for defense housing under the act of October 14, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of Mr. RUSSELL's motion that the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 98 and 99 to the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, the last thing I desire is to take a position resembling a departure from support of the very able chairman of the Senate conferees and the subcommittee of our Appropriations Committee, with whom I have labored through long hours of hearings and, it would seem, almost longer hours of conference in an endeavor to iron out the differences existing between the Senate and the House with respect to the pending appropriation bill. That chairman, the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is deserving of every bit of confidence the Senate has expressed and bestowed upon him; and to depart from agreement with his views on the pending motion is not a pleasure on my part.

But with his motion to have the Senate recede from its position in support of continuation of Federal crop insurance I must disagree, even to the extent of urging that his motion be defeated and the issue returned once again to conference.

It is true that the House has thus far proven relentless in its determination to kick crop insurance overboard. It has voted about 2 to 1 to sustain the position of its conferees. But the Senate has voted 5 or 6 to 1 to sustain our own conferees in support of crop insurance. Surely that entitles the Senate to further consideration at the hands of the House.

Moreover, in order to win enactment of this annual appropriation bill, the Senate and its conferees have receded from their position on a number of most vital issues. So wide were the differences between the House and Senate on this bill that there had to be broadness in accomplishing compromises. Surely the House cannot successfully maintain that the Senate has not been most liberal in its effort to iron out the differences and accomplish enactment of this necessary legislation.

On the question of farm security the Senate went far in the way of surrender

in order to accomplish continued life for this agency which means so much to so many. It was not easy for me, as a member of the conference, to surrender on the items of money to be made available to F. S. A. But surrender we did, to the end that F. S. A. would not be abandoned completely in this grave hour.

I have never before experienced quite as much difficulty as that which I experienced when, in order to save other advantages for the farmer, I joined our other conference members in abandoning the Senate position in support of authorizing parity payments next year on crops that might not have attained parity prices in the market. But I surrendered in that instance—and I think other conferees entertained like notions—only because I felt convinced that before another winter came there would be readiness in the House of Representatives to see how all-important it would be to afford such authorization if food production was to be attained.

I leave the subject of crop insurance long enough to recite facts that make continuation of parity money seem inevitable.

Wheat is the only commodity which has not attained a parity price. Wheat prices are still about 20 cents a bushel under parity.

The only support left for the wheat farmer since the parity payments are outlawed by the action of Congress on the agricultural appropriation bill is the 85-percent loan availability. This loan at 85 percent of parity is just about the market price for wheat today. The chance of the wheat farmer receiving a parity price is nil, especially with the ceiling prices prevailing on flour and bread.

The miller and the baker, in order to come out even on their transactions, cannot afford to pay more than 85 percent of the parity price for wheat. So, between the Government and its ceiling-price program and the miller and baker purchases of wheat and flour, there is not left the ghost of a chance for the wheat farmer to get a parity price since the parity payments for next year are thus far denied.

Yet, the Government is asking the farmer to give the country and the world an increase of about 30 percent in wheat production next year.

Who is foolish enough to believe that the farmer is going to produce more wheat when he can get only 85 percent of parity as a price for it instead of turning his acres to crops that are commanding better prices?

If the Government is going to continue to try to hold the line with its price-ceiling program the Government must provide the way to win fair prices for the production of wheat. The obvious answer seems to be in restoration of the availability of parity money for the 1944 crop. How can Congress long ignore this obvious fact? I am glad to note that the grain interests of the country, including especially the Federal Association of Grain Cooperatives, are to launch a campaign directing attention to the serious threat which the present situation is offering.

It is not surprising that the wheat farmer is distressed by what we are leaving in prospect for him. This demand for wheat at prices under parity is just one more headache to add to those created by machinery shortages and labor shortages along with the regular headaches with which the farmer has to contend. One of these days the American farmer is going to demand to know what are the plans of the administration for American agriculture in the years to come. Are we getting ready to ditch the American farmer so that we can be the market for the farmers of the world? On March 14, 1940, I said before the New York Board of Trade.

If the time has come when American agriculture is to be abandoned as a basic, if not the basic, American industry, with the world an outlet for our manufactured production in exchange for the world's agricultural production, let there be no deception about it. Give warning to the farmers that this is the goal, and thus give them a chance to adjust themselves to that which will follow.

That was in 1940, when there seemed to be some little indication that the American farmer was about to be sold down the river to the end that America should become a great market for the world in manufactured products, to be traded for the agricultural production of the rest of the world. Only this spring George D. Riley, writing in the Washington Times-Herald and quoting F. F. Elliott, Chief Agricultural Economist of the Department of Agriculture, said, among other things:

The outline—

Speaking of the outline and the plan of Mr. Elliott and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics—

fits in snugly with recurrent reports that the planners have in mind creation of a hugely industrialized United States with Latin America supplying the food.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article by Mr. Riley be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of February 3, 1943]

CAPITAL COMPASS

(By George D. Riley and Page Huidekoper)

We used to chuckle a bit over the one about the hayseed moron who moved to the city because he heard the country was at war, but since we've learned about plans being drawn up in the Department of Agriculture we're not sure about that moron story being funny.

It seems the Bureau of Agricultural Economics wants to make 20 percent of the rural population of the United States move to cities after the war, whether the ruralites like it or not.

F. F. Elliott, chief agricultural economist of the Department, says the plan to cut post-war rural population to 80 percent of its present level is in line with the projected re-vamping of American economy and possibly that of the entire world.

The outline fits in snugly with recurrent reports that the planners have in mind creation of a hugely industrialized United States with Latin America supplying the food.

FARM CONTROL PLAN

Elliott tentatively suggests that farm production be maintained "at such levels and in such patterns as to permit adequate diets adapted to the economic resources and food habits of the different income groups."

The blue print he is drawing up would include an organized market system, controlled presumably by the Government, with fixed prices for the farmer, the marketman, and the consumer.

Elliott says the plan is in line with objectives set forth in the Atlantic Charter, especially the third of the "four freedoms"—freedom from want.

Maybe the rubes will be able to stay in the country after the war if they want, though, because Elliott did admit "it may be that the goals actually realized will fall somewhat short of the ideals we have discussed."

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, it is high time to be giving incentives to the farmers, not the time to be removing those incentives and protections, such as crop insurance. This week the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] introduced a bill calling for an appropriation of \$15,000,000 to be used for the relief of farmers in Missouri, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Arkansas, and Oklahoma who recently lost their homes, crops, and livestock in the disastrous May floods; and yet there are those who have condemned and are seeking to abolish the Federal crop-insurance program, saying that it is impracticable because its books show a capital loss of about \$20,000,000 after 4 years of operation—4 years of operation during which it has brought insurance benefits to farmers whose crops were destroyed by natural causes over which they had no more control than the unfortunate farmers had over the recent May floods.

Every Member of the Senate is aware of the devastation which followed the May floods in those States. Senators will also, no doubt, be interested in knowing just what part the Federal crop-insurance program has played in these flood areas this year. In 183 counties there were 61,314 wheat and cotton farmers whose crops were insured. Of those insured producers, it is estimated that 20,364 lost all or a major part of their growing crops on 340,390 acres. This is a major loss for these producers, and it is a major loss for the Corporation; but that is exactly why the Congress provided our farmers with this form of crop protection, for which they pay a reasonable premium, just as they pay their fire- or life-insurance premiums. The insured farmer in the flooded areas did not lose his crop income.

This flood loss is recent—and its devastation dramatic. But somewhere in the United States every year that the Federal crop-insurance program has been in operation, thousands of farmers have suffered crop losses just as costly—and they will continue to do so as long as they must follow the hazardous occupation of farming. Certainly, now, when this Nation needs food as never before, is no time to remove this protection for the American farmers.

SUMMARY OF OPERATIONS

The losses in these flood areas are great—but each year during its opera-

tions on wheat alone, the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation has provided far greater protection and exposed itself to the possibility of far greater loss than that provided in this flood relief measure.

During the past 4 years—1939 through 1942—the Corporation insured the production of 363,446,000 bushels of wheat on a total of 1,296,200 farms, in round numbers. For this protection, insured farmers paid premiums totaling 41,879,000 bushels. During that period crop losses were sustained by 407,636 farmers, who were paid indemnities totaling 62,453,000 bushels. In providing this protection to wheat farmers the Corporation sustained a net loss of 20,574,000 bushels, involving \$17,994,111.

Cotton crops were insured for the first time in 1942, when 176,000 farmers paid premiums amounting to 63,000 bales; and as of May 31, 1943, 46,800 of these farmers collected 103,000 bales of indemnities for crop losses. Among the heaviest of these losses were crop failures resulting from floods and hail.

PARTICIPATION OF FARMERS IS INCREASING

The number of farms insured under the wheat program has shown a steady increase each year:

In 1939 there were 165,775 farms insured; in 1940 there were 379,710 farms insured; in 1941 there were 420,939 farms insured; in 1942 there were 503,266 farms insured; in 1943 there were 512,000 farms insured.

It is to be noted that the farms insured in 1943 are for the first time insured for a 3-year period.

In the first year of wheat insurance approximately 10 percent to 11 percent of the farms were insured. This was about the same percentage for cotton in its first year with approximately 176,000 farms.

FARMERS NOW TAKING CROP INSURANCE FOR THE "LONG PULL"

Farmers are accepting crop insurance as a desirable business practice instead of merely as an occasional "flyer" to gamble against a bad year.

In the summer of 1942 the Corporation announced that all wheat contracts beginning on the 1943 crop would be for a period of 3 years. The fact that approximately half a million wheat farms are now covered by this new longer term contract for 1943-44-45 is clear evidence that farmers are taking crop insurance for the "long pull."

FARMERS HAVE AN INVESTMENT IN CROP INSURANCE

Many farmers have carried their crop insurance through good years knowing that they could "come out on it" only in the long run, but that in the long run they would need it. Some of them have invested thousands of bushels of wheat with the Corporation on this basis. In some instances the total of these premium payments exceeds the amount the individual farmer would receive if he had a complete loss at the present time.

These farmers have continued their premium payments because they knew that the resources of the Federal Government were great enough to protect

their investment in crop insurance during the first trial period. They did so because they believed that the Congress was determined to provide a sufficient time in which to place Federal crop insurance on a sound permanent basis or to prove definitely that it was impracticable. It is recognized that the former position has not been reached. I am sure that the farmers would not agree that the latter has been proved. Under such circumstances, it probably would be much more difficult in the future to gain their confidence in the stability and intention of other Government programs in which they are asked to participate on the basis of immediate contributions for future, long-time benefits.

GOVERNMENT HAS AN INVESTMENT IN CROP INSURANCE

The Government has invested a substantial sum of money in a pioneering, American endeavor to provide American farmers with security against crop failure. Considerable stress has been laid upon the matter of costs by saying that it has cost the Government \$23,000,000—administrative expenses—to give wheat and cotton farmers about \$20,000,000—operating losses, in benefits. This is not the real picture.

The true picture of these operations is that it has cost the Federal Government about \$23,000,000 to provide approximately \$55,000,000 of benefits to farmers who have suffered crop losses. Of this \$55,000,000 in benefits, the farmers themselves have contributed about \$35,000,000 in premiums.

Nor does that even complete the picture. One little appreciates the responsibilities under the law which the Crop Insurance Corporation has had to assume. It likely will interest the Congress to know that the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation actually carries over 3,000,000 records on its books. That is to say, it has had to go to an enormous expense in setting up premium rates and the average yields per acre on every wheat and cotton farm. The law so charged the Corporation. There are, as nearly as can be ascertained, 1,556,000 cotton allotment farms in 19 States, and about 1,500,000 wheat allotment farms in 36 States. The premium rates and average yields for every one of those farms have been established, and are now available to tenant or landowner with an interest in a cotton or wheat crop. He can call at the county A. A. A. office in his county and sign an insurance application and premium note within 5 minutes, provided he applies before he plants his crop and within the time limit set by the Corporation.

During the 4 years of operations, this rate and yield information has been constantly improved upon. This insurance information is a very real asset to be counted against the investment which the Government has made in this program—but this asset can be capitalized upon only by continued operation of the program.

In many instances the Crop Insurance Corporation has increased the rates to prevail for this insurance. In some sections they have been increased as much as 15 percent. It is fair to assume that

in another 2 or 3 years there will have been accomplished an adjustment which will allow crop insurance to carry itself.

EXPERIENCE IS BEGINNING TO PAY DIVIDENDS

The investment in Federal crop insurance is just now at a point where it is paying dividends in the experience of administration. To abandon the program now is to abandon this effort at the very time when it is possible to base operations upon experience rather than theory, as was necessary in the first years of the program.

For example: First, there is the showing of operating cost reduction: The cost of handling each wheat-insurance unit has been cut 56 percent since the first year beginning in 1939. Furthermore, it cost only 63 percent as much to handle each cotton-insurance unit in 1942, the first year of cotton insurance, as it did to handle each wheat-insurance unit in 1939, the first year of wheat insurance.

Second, operating losses have been reduced: The excess of indemnities over premiums for wheat insurance has been reduced from 66 percent in 1940 to 49 percent in 1941, and to a low of 20 percent in 1942.

Third, there has been a vast improvement in contract provisions. Many changes and improvements have been made in the provisions of the contract. One of the most important is the adoption of a 3-year term contract for wheat. The Crop Insurance Act prohibited the making of contracts for a period longer than 1 year during the first 3 years of operation. This not only increased the administrative expenses, but also increased the loss experience of the Corporation. Under the 1-year contract, the farmer had an opportunity to come into the program for a year when crop conditions appeared unfavorable and stay out when the prospects just ahead of seeding time appeared good. In other words, to some extent farmers were given a chance to outguess the Corporation, and some of them did so. Since the beginning of 1943 the Corporation has been operating under a 3-year contract, the maximum benefits of which will not be realized until the 1944 crop year. Other improvements have been made in contract requirements and adjustment procedures as a result of operating experience.

Mr. President, once we have perfected a thoroughly safe and businesslike method of insuring growing crops of wheat and cotton, the Congress can then extend Federal crop insurance to other crops, if it so desires. Let me emphasize that the Corporation cannot include other crops. Only by amending the Federal Crop Insurance Act can the Congress extend this form of protection to the producers of other crops.

OPERATIONS COMPARE FAVORABLY WITH COMMERCIAL COMPANIES

It is not possible to measure farms, establish rates, prepare accurate yield information, collect premiums, and distribute benefits without incurring expense. Compared with the operations of private insurance companies, the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation has been administered very economically.

The total income of the Corporation during the first 4 years has been about \$43,000,000 furnished by the Government and about \$35,000,000 in premiums by farmers, a total of about \$78,000,000. Fifty-five million dollars of this has gone for benefits distributed back to farmers, leaving a balance of about \$23,000,000, which represents administrative expense.

This means that the expense ratio of the Corporation has been approximately 30 percent, as compared with a combined average of approximately 41 percent for stock and mutual fire insurance companies.

DOES NOT COMPETE WITH PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

Federal crop insurance does not compete with any privately financed insurance company for there is no other agency or corporation that writes all-risk crop insurance. All-risk crop insurance means just what the name implies. It protects the farmer from losses caused by all natural hazards such as droughts, floods, excessive moisture, insect and animal pests, wind, hail, frost, winter kill, and so forth.

At various times private companies have recognized the need for this type of insurance and have attempted to write it. But after repeated attempts they have failed and retired from the field. There were many reasons for these failures, some of them being lack of adequate actuarial information, insurance of price as well as yield, and lack of a national spread of the risk and operations. The greatest reason probably was that no single private company was willing to or able to absorb the initial losses inevitable in establishing such a program on a national basis.

There were no all-risk crop insurance companies operating in the field at the time the Federal crop insurance program was established. Furthermore, before this program was recommended the President's committee on crop insurance met with representatives of commercial insurance companies and received their approval and support of the program.

FARM ORGANIZATIONS WANT CROP INSURANCE

Each of the three Nation-wide farm organizations have asked for the continuation of Federal crop insurance. In testimony before the Senate subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, Edward A. O'Neal, president, American Farm Bureau Federation, stated:

Retain crop-insurance program for wheat and cotton until further trial of this program can be made. * * * I think it will succeed. (Hearings, pp. 729-730.)

James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, stated:

Our established crop-insurance program should be retained * * * the millions of lower income farmers need insurance protection today just as much as when crop insurance was instituted. They have no reserves. They can be ruined by crop failures. * * * We are just really getting started on crop insurance. (Hearings, pp. 835-836.)

Albert S. Goss, master of the National Grange, stated:

The need for a workable plan of crop insurance has long been apparent. At present neither cooperative nor private agencies ap-

pear to be equipped to carry a practical crop-insurance program. Under the circumstances, the Grange has given its support to the Government crop-insurance program. * * * We believe that the plan should be continued and its plan gradually broadened as experience justifies. (Hearings, pp. 909-910.)

For my own State, Glenn J. Talbott, president, North Dakota Farmers Union, and member of the executive council of the National Farmers Union, stated:

We recommend the Budget request for administrative funds, \$7,718,748 as compared to the House figure of \$3,500,000, and that the last proviso in the House bill be stricken out completely.

In North Dakota crop-insurance programs are carrying themselves to the extent of a little more than a million and a half bushels over indemnities paid thus far. (Hearings, pp. 881-882.)

The proviso in the House bill, referred to by Mr. Talbott, is the one which amounted to an ordering of liquidation. NOW IS NO TIME TO ABANDON CROP INSURANCE

In the past, A. A. A. commodity payments to wheat and cotton farmers have provided a small measure of insurance to the producer. As farm prices rise or the amount of these payments is decreased, this protection becomes proportionally less. High prices and commodity loans provide no income for farmers whose crops have failed. Crop insurance does, and, in addition, provides a substantial credit base for his farming operations.

The Federal Government is asking farmers throughout the country to make sharp increases in their production of many war crops. This expansion involves added production risks. The farmer who has the security of crop insurance is in a better position to carry these inevitable increased risks in his expansion of war crops. To abolish the crop-insurance program now would be for the Federal Government to deny existing crop-insurance protection to wheat and cotton farmers at the same time that it is asking them to assume added production burdens and risks to help win the war. Such action would hardly seem to be consistent with the general policy to aid farmers in their all-out war-production effort.

NEED FOR CROP INSURANCE REMAINS

Furthermore, the proposed abolishment of Federal crop-insurance protection to wheat and cotton farmers does not abolish either the hazards to these two crops or the consequences of crop failure to the producers and their communities. Nor does the action taken provide any alternative to meet the financial and human costs of crop failure which led to the establishment of a Federal crop-insurance program after 20 years of effort on the part of farmers and investigations by the Federal Government.

Adoption of Federal crop insurance was hastened by the disastrous crop failures in many areas which brought a heavy relief burden upon the Federal Government in the 1930's. To abandon this effort to enable wheat and cotton farmers to provide themselves with a measure of security against crop losses

is once again to expose the Federal Government to the full measure of the relief burden in years of crop failure.

But a system of crop insurance will do more than lighten the relief load on Government in time of crop failure. It will also enable the American farmer to maintain a greater measure of independence by providing his own protection against years of loss.

To use insurance for this purpose requires thrift and foresight on the part of the farmer. But the farmer must have more than that. He must also have the opportunity to do so—the opportunity to insure himself and his family against the hazards of production and the loss of living income.

Industry has this opportunity through both private and Government channels. Labor has it through Government sponsored unemployment insurance. Only the Federal Government can provide this opportunity for farmers and round out a system of protection for America's major producing groups.

To abandon crop insurance after only 4 years of chance to properly adjust rates and risks is bad faith upon the part of Congress. I hope the Senate will insist upon another conference with the House on this vital issue, this action which can and does mean so much in the way of a betterment of conditions for the wheat and cotton farmers and so much to the Government in the way of freedom from direct relief responsibilities.

I should like, Mr. President, to add but one thought. Federal crop insurance was created by legislation passed by both the Senate and the House of Representatives. No one has had the temerity through regular legislative channels to move the repeal of Federal crop insurance. Instead, the opponents of the system wait their chance to use as a vehicle for repeal an appropriation bill that comes to the Senate late, affording us little or no opportunity to do the kind of work on this and other such bills which every member of the committee wants to do.

They come at the last moment, and then, in the interest of obtaining the passage of the bill before the end of the fiscal year, insist that there must not be more consideration than that which has already been afforded.

I hope that the Senate will insist upon its crop-insurance amendment and, much as I dislike to request it, deny the action which the Senator in charge of the conference report has requested in his motion to recede and accept the House provisions.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. NYE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that there are hundreds of thousands of farmers who signed up 3-year crop-insurance contracts last year?

Mr. NYE. I do not know just how many, but I think it is fair to say there were hundreds of thousands.

Mr. REED. The number was 487,000.

Mr. LANGER. It was my recollection the number was nearly half a million; and they were relying on the Government.

Mr. NYE. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. They signed a contract saying, "If you sign up at this rate for 3 years, you will be insured." It is a further fact, is it not, that they would not insure for 1 year, that they insisted on a 3-year contract just a year ago?

Mr. NYE. The Senator means the farmers would not sign a 1-year contract?

Mr. LANGER. No; the Government.

Mr. NYE. That is correct. The only insurance made available until a year ago was on a 1-year basis.

Mr. LANGER. Then they changed it to a 3-year basis, as the distinguished Senator from Kansas has stated, and the farmers signed up for 3 years, and they now have a contract for 3 years. If the motion of the Senator from Georgia shall prevail, 487,000 farmers will suffer.

Mr. NYE. The farmers will have experienced a very definite act of bad faith on the part of their Government.

Mr. REED. With the permission of the Senator from North Dakota may I offer a comment?

Mr. NYE. I am through.

Mr. REED. I want the junior Senator from North Dakota to understand that I intruded upon the conference committee yesterday, when I stated what the Senator from North Dakota has said, that there are 487,000 3-year contracts outstanding, and asked whether we were going to walk off and leave them. I was reminded that in each of those contracts was an escape clause, whereby the test of whether the Government would carry it out depended on an appropriation by Congress. Of course, that is correct, but how many of the 487,000 farmers when they signed, realized that the Government could walk out if it felt like doing so?

Mr. NYE. Of course, there was no such thought on the part of the farmers.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. NYE. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. There appeared in last night's New York Sun an item about which I should like a word of information and comment from the Senator from North Dakota. In the column These Days by George E. Sokolsky appears the following:

A farmer sends me a photostat of a document entitled "War Production Program—1943 Farm Plan." This is issued by the United States Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Adjustment Agency, and tells a farmer how much he can grow. These instructions are for this summer when we are all being told that there is a shortage and we are all being propagandized to plant Victory gardens—although we are not being given gasoline to reach these aforementioned areas of agricultural provisioning.

This particular farm consists of 98 acres. The cropland consists of 74.5 acres. The farmer who ran this acreage in 1941 was permitted to plant 15 acres of wheat. His measurement was inaccurate or God, the sun, rains, and hard work blessed him and when the crop was harvested, lo and behold, he had produced 19 acres of wheat. He was fined \$198 for producing.

In 1943, although he can use 74.5 acres, he has been allotted 20 acres of wheat, 4 acres of alfalfa and 10 of potatoes—and no more. For this he will receive a production-practice allowance of \$40.87. If he grows more he will

be in trouble. There is also a provision which reads, "An additional \$15 may be earned by planting 2 acres of forest trees." Who wants forest trees when we need to eat potatoes?

Will the Senator from North Dakota please tell us, if he can, first, whether or not in 1941 there prevailed a practice by which this farmer could legally be limited to a planting of 15 acres of wheat?

Mr. NYE. There did.

Mr. DANAHER. And he at that time could and probably was subjected to a penalty of \$198 for overproducing?

Mr. NYE. I presume he was. I have heard of more severe penalties for a smaller offense than seems to have been involved in this case. There was a time when a farmer, so the story ran, was afraid to come out of the wheatfield at seeding time and shake himself for fear that some kernels of wheat would fall out of the cuffs of his trousers and he would be seeding some wheat that would find him in the fall having planted an overacreage, which would result in a penalty at once.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me ask the Senator from North Dakota whether it is still a fact that, under the bill now before us, House bill 2481, provision is made for continuation in 1944 of an allotment program, thus preventing this particular farmer from planting more than 20 acres of wheat.

Mr. NYE. All provisions of that kind are now gone from the bill. Such provision is in the law, but the pending appropriation bill does not provide any means of any authorization for commitments which would permit the allotment program to be carried on next year.

Mr. DANAHER. The law which prevailed in 1941, and which will be abandoned in 1944, is in effect this year, 1943?

Mr. NYE. No; it has been abandoned entirely, in respect to wheat, at least. There will be no restrictions upon wheat acreage this year.

Mr. DANAHER. Here is an article by a very able writer—

Mr. NYE. We all respect him as such.

Mr. DANAHER. Who, of course, is relying upon what he says is a photostat of a document issued by the United States Department of Agriculture, which purports to allot to this particular farmer correspondent of his only 20 acres to wheat, 4 acres to alfalfa, and 10 to potatoes.

Mr. NYE. If my memory serves me correctly, last spring the triple A did undertake the usual allotment program, and then resorted to a great many changes, which finally lifted all restrictions from the planting of wheat and some other crops. Perhaps the Senator from Kansas can further clarify that point.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me ask a question to point up whatever answer may be forthcoming from the Senator from Kansas and from the Senator from North Dakota. Is there in the pending bill even \$1 which will be paid to someone for restricting production of foodstuffs?

Mr. NYE. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. What foodstuffs are thus restricted?

Mr. NYE. Tobacco is one.

Mr. DANAHER. I do not like tobacco for breakfast. I refer to food.

Mr. NYE. Some count tobacco a food. This bill provides money for the payment of benefits to cotton producers who have complied with their program.

Mr. DANAHER. I do not eat cotton.

Mr. NYE. One cannot eat cotton, of course. I think no foodstuffs are affected.

Mr. AIKEN. Cotton is one of the largest crops we have.

Mr. NYE. The Senator from Connecticut does not eat it.

Mr. DANAHER. We use it in making cottonseed meal and cottonseed oil and cake.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the remainder of Mr. Sokolsky's article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remainder of the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

That man could plant the whole of his 74.5 acres if he could get farm labor, machinery, and gasoline to do it.

Now, I want to ask what is the sense of such restrictions? What good do they do us? What sense does it make to have any restrictions on agricultural production at all when there is such pressing need for more and more food?

This particular instance is an index to the weakness of Mr. Roosevelt's administration. It never gets organized. It works at cross purposes. It is so personalized that a bureau functions without regard to the necessities of the moment simply because it will not stop functioning when it is no longer needed.

The War Labor Board is another example of administrative maladroitness. Mr. Roosevelt actually faced two strikes, one on the part of John L. Lewis, the other on the part of War Labor Board, which took the position that if Harold Ickes made a sane and businesslike settlement of the coal strike, it, the War Labor Board, would resign in a body. In other words, nothing mattered but that this Board's face be saved. Our mandarins are worse than the Chinese; the Chinese mandarins sometimes removed themselves from impossible situations by committing suicide as a service to their people. Our mandarins will not remove themselves from a public job no matter what happens to the country. Once they get on the public pay roll they hang on for dear life unless the corporations they have been attacking hire them away.

A couple of weeks ago the country thrilled to the thought that all this was to be corrected, that Byrnes, advised and assisted by Baruch, would put an end to these bureaucratic monkeyshines, that they would streamline administration. The weeks are passing but nothing is being done along these lines. No obstructions to efficient management of the country's business have been removed. I do not question the ability of either Byrnes or Baruch; but they are not being permitted to hire and fire, to reorganize, consolidate, amalgamate, and cut out the administrative nonsense that is distressing and perturbing this Nation.

Governor Tom Dewey is standing out in front of the Republican parade because he is attacking the one dread evil which the whole American people is now recognizing—administrative incoherence. The people know that the administration is cockeyed. They still do not blame Roosevelt because they say he is busy with the war, but any student of public opinion can recognize that what Tom Dewey says about the management of

our business is making a deep impression upon a long-suffering, loyal, and patriotic people.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota has the floor. To whom does he yield?

Mr. NYE. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. I should like the comment of the Senator from Kansas on this general subject.

Mr. REED. With the permission of the Senator from North Dakota—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota has the floor.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator yield so that I may answer the question of the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. NYE. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. REED. Up to March of this year, I think it was March when the Secretary of Agriculture lifted all restrictions upon wheat acreage—

Mr. LANGER. It was April.

Mr. REED. I stand corrected. I accept the statement of the junior Senator from North Dakota. The Secretary of Agriculture lifted all restrictions on wheat acreage. Up to that time the restrictions did apply. In cases where the farmers themselves, by two-thirds vote, adopted a marketing quota upon wheat, the Secretary of Agriculture was authorized, and really required, to collect a penalty on wheat marketed outside the agricultural adjustment program.

Mr. President, that law was carried out, including the crop harvested in 1942, and some rather severe injustices resulted.

When the Secretary of Agriculture removed that restriction in the spring of this year any farmer who had not sold his wheat was relieved from the penalty. A farmer who had sold his wheat had paid the penalty. An injustice was done to the one who produced and marketed his crop in the same crop year. I have a bill pending before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and Representative HOPE, of Kansas, has a similar bill pending in the House, which would permit those who paid the penalty to be placed on the same basis as those who had not produced and sold wheat in the same crop year and were thus not obliged to pay the penalty.

Mr. President, I do not know whether I have answered the inquiry of the Senator from Connecticut. In my opinion a very definite injustice was done to the producer of wheat who produced and sold his wheat in the same crop year. I wish to say to the Senator from Connecticut that there are not now any restrictions upon the production of any crop, except, as has been developed, tobacco and cotton.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from North Dakota who have taken part in the discussion, because it seems to me to be important to develop the facts with reference to this policy. It would most assuredly be an anomaly in this year of impending shortages if production were to be restricted.

Mr. NYE. I thoroughly agree with the Senator in that conclusion.

Mr. REED. Permit me to say, Mr. President, that when the head of the Commodity Credit Corporation appeared before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry he urged that 15,000,000 more acres of wheat be planted this year than were planted last year. It would be very poor policy to impose penalties upon those who would raise more wheat under such a program.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I hope the motion of the Senator from Georgia will not prevail, because I am satisfied that if the Senators on the floor really understood the desperate plight of the average wheat grower in America they would vote against the motion. If there is anything I know thoroughly, it is the problem of the wheat farmers.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. Let me ask the Senator a question. In view of the attitude of the conferees on the part of the House, there is no possibility of having the crop insurance feature incorporated in the bill. The House has voted on the crop insurance feature four times. I deplore the elimination of the provision as much as does any other Member of the Senate; but in view of the attitude of the House, if we reject the motion of the Senator from Georgia, what are we to do?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, let me say that the cotton farmers have been taken care of. The peanut farmers have been taken care of.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, let me inquire how the cotton farmer has been taken care of.

Mr. LANGER. Because the cotton farmers get parity, but the wheat farmers have not yet gotten parity.

Mr. SMITH. That is an accident.

Mr. LANGER. But it is the situation.

Mr. SMITH. I understand that; but how does the Senator hope to get the crop insurance provision into the bill, in view of the present situation?

Mr. LANGER. If I were one of the conferees I would go to the conference and would stay there forever, if necessary, until the crop-insurance provisions were agreed to. Why should hundreds of thousands of wheat farmers be sacrificed?

Mr. SMITH. I understand the necessity, and I understand the deplorable condition. Nevertheless, we are endeavoring to legislate, and we must legislate with the consent of the House. The House absolutely refuses to give consent to the crop-insurance provision.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. NYE. I should like to address myself to the question the Senator from South Carolina has propounded. I have been sitting as a member of the conference, as has the Senator from South Carolina. I am not so sure as he seems to be that the House will maintain its position in spite of what we do about the matter.

Mr. SMITH. The House voted just yesterday.

Mr. NYE. I understand it did; but I have very good reason to believe that if the Senate will stand its ground today, the House will recede on that item.

Mr. SMITH. If the Senator can make me feel that that is a certainty, I should be willing to fight for the crop-insurance provision. Some 20 years ago the Senator from Oregon and I wire members of a committee to investigate the possibility of having crop insurance. We recommended it, but it was a long time afterward before it was put into effect.

Eight miles below my Lee County farm, week before last, a hail storm destroyed every vestige of crops—cotton, corn, tobacco, and so forth. Seventy-five percent of the crops were insured. The owners would have been ruined had it not been for the insurance. To my mind it is one of the most hopeful and reassuring programs that have ever been adopted by the Congress. It has not had time to work itself out to the point where it would be self-sustaining. I cannot understand the position of the House, except that perhaps it is based on the loss which has been incurred.

Mr. LANGER. I am very well acquainted with the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, the dean of the Senate. No Member of the Senate has more tenacity, more real "guts," than has the senior Senator from South Carolina. I know that if he makes up his mind to go into the conference and fight he can get this crop insurance. I am satisfied of it.

Consider the position of the average wheat farmer. We have already practically strangled the Farm Security Administration. It is dying a slow death. There is no question about that, in view of the report of the conference committee. I think the Senator will agree with that statement.

Mr. SMITH. I do.

Mr. LANGER. Consider the average farmer in the Northwest. I direct my remarks to the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]. He can bear me out. When the average young couple are married, they may have a little debt. They go to a bank to borrow money to put in a crop of wheat. If the crop insurance is in force, the bank, knowing that it will be insured, will probably lend them the money. If they cannot get it from the bank, they may get the seed from the Government. They go along, and what happens? After the grain gets up a little it may freeze, or if it is up a little higher the wind may level it to the ground. If that does not happen, there is likely to be a drought—and I have seen the effects of droughts on thousands of acres.

Mr. SMITH. The Senator is not telling me anything that I do not know from experience.

Mr. LANGER. That is the reason the Senator is for crop insurance.

Mr. SMITH. I would do all in my power in behalf of crop insurance. The Senator speaks of obstinacy. I have been on conference committees with Members of the House, and they can be just as obstinate as we can. It is like the old saying about an irresistible force meeting an immovable object. It is just

a hell of a butt, and we do not get anywhere.

If the Senator's colleague is correct, and he has some assurance other than wishful thinking, I am perfectly willing to have the question go back to conference, and cuss some more. That is about all it has amounted to up to the present time.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, my information is something more than wishful thinking. Perhaps there is a little wishful thinking woven into it, but it is not all wishful thinking. I hope the Senate will insist upon its amendments.

Mr. SMITH. Does the Senator have any reasonable ground to believe that the House will change its position?

Mr. NYE. I have.

Mr. SMITH. After four votes?

Mr. NYE. After four votes.

Mr. SMITH. Does the Senator mean to say that we are wearing down the House, or is there a change in conviction?

Mr. NYE. The evidence would not indicate that we are wearing down the House. As matters stand in the House, its most recent record vote was about 2 to 1 against the proposal to continue crop insurance. The Senate has a record of 5 or 6 to 1.

Mr. SMITH. I am not talking about the Senate.

Mr. NYE. I am told that if we will stand our ground in the Senate, there is a good prospect that the House will alter its position. Beyond that I am not at liberty to say.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from South Carolina a question?

Mr. SMITH. Certainly.

Mr. LANGER. Let me appeal to the Senator once more to go back to conference and fight as he has never fought before in order to save crop insurance for the wheat and cotton farmers.

Mr. SMITH. If I had anything with which to fight, or if we had some means of persuading the House to take this or something worse, we might get somewhere. I am perfectly willing to try again. I do not wish to fall out with the Senator's colleague, Mr. Nye, but if he has deceived me, I will give him the devil afterward. [Laughter.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am as much in favor of crop insurance as is the junior Senator from North Dakota. I know the necessity of it, and I know the merit in the whole program. However, I understand that in this appropriation bill there are funds to take care of the 1943 insurance, and that there may be some possibility, in some other appropriation bill, deficiency bill, or authorization bill, of taking care of the 1944 insurance. So this is not the final word. If 1943 is taken care of, that will take us up to January 1, and perhaps we can work out something between now and then.

Mr. LANGER. Is the Senator from Colorado on the conference committee?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; I am not on the conference committee.

Mr. SMITH. I think the Senator has reference to the 3-year contract.

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. There is a 3-year contract still in existence. It runs into 1944, and I believe that is the end.

Mr. LANGER. But there is no appropriation for it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. There is provision in this bill for 1943.

Mr. LANGER. For 1943, but not for 1944. I should like to have the Senator from Colorado point out any provision for 1944.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The question of 1944 is pending; but 1943 is taken care of.

Mr. SMITH. I think the 3-year contract is taken care of in this bill.

Mr. LANGER. No; it is not.

Mr. NYE. The 1943 contract?

Mr. SMITH. There is a 3-year contract.

Mr. NYE. The bill provides for the continuation of insurance which is already in force.

Mr. SMITH. That is the 3-year contract.

Mr. NYE. But no new contract may be entered into.

Mr. SMITH. The bill takes care of contracts which are in existence.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in view of the statement of the senior Senator from South Carolina that he is willing to battle once more, I will yield the floor; but if the conference report comes back and it is still against the wheat farmer, I reserve the right to speak again on the subject.

Mr. SMITH. I hope the Senator does not have the idea that members of the conference would not fight as hard for the wheat farmer as they would for the producer of any other major crop.

Mr. LANGER. I know the Senator from South Carolina would.

Mr. SMITH. I almost gave up hope when the vote was taken yesterday in the House, because that was the fourth time the House of Representatives had voted on the question. If there is a chance, I shall vote to reject the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell] and try once more; but I serve notice now that we must find some way to keep the crop insurance going.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator very much indeed.

Mr. SMITH. If the House will not do it, let us put it on some appropriation bill and get it through anyway.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell].

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Burton	Eastland
Andrews	Butler	Ferguson
Austin	Byrd	George
Ball	Capper	Gerry
Bankhead	Caraway	Green
Barkley	Chandler	Guffey
Bilbo	Chavez	Gurney
Bone	Clark, Mo.	Hawkes
Brewster	Connally	Hayden
Bridges	Danaher	Hill
Brooks	Davis	Holman
Buck	Downey	Johnson, Colo.

Kilgore	Nye	Thomas, Utah
La Follette	O'Daniel	Tobey
Langer	O'Mahoney	Truman
Lodge	Overton	Tunnell
Lucas	Pepper	Tydings
McCarran	Radcliffe	Vandenberg
McClellan	Reed	Van Nuys
McFarland	Revercomb	Wagner
McKellar	Reynolds	Wallgren
McNary	Robertson	Walsh
Maloney	Russell	Wheeler
Maybank	Scruggs	Wherry
Mead	Shipstead	White
Millikin	Smith	Willis
Moore	Stewart	Wilson
Murdoch	Taft	
Murray	Thomas, Okla.	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Murdoch in the chair). Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST INLAND WATER CARRIERS

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Recently the Supreme Court of the United States handed down a decision that is of great interest to Members of the Congress in connection with legislation which was enacted to assure transportation on the inland waterways and to protect producers who had hoped to make use of the inland waterways in the handling of the transportation of freight.

Congress passed what was called the Transportation Act of 1940. That act placed under the control of the Interstate Commerce Commission the regulation of rates by rail, and truck, and also by barges on the inland waterways. There was a great deal of opposition to that bill in 1940 because many legislators feared—and so stated on the floor of the Senate as well as of the House—that the inland waterway transportation would suffer under the domination and regulation of the Interstate Commerce Commission for the reason that the Commission was said at that time by many Senators and Members of the House to be a railroad-minded body. Assurances were given, however, and a section was written into the law directing the Interstate Commerce Commission, in the regulation of rates, to give the benefit to the inherent savings which could be made by the waterways in the arrangement of rates, and providing that the Commission should not discriminate against the waterways, but that inherent advantage of low-cost water transportation should be protected.

Under such assurances from the sponsors of the legislation and because of amendments which were added, the bill finally passed.

The decision handed down by the Supreme Court on the 14th day of June repudiates this act of Congress and the particular section dealing with the protection of the waterways.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It is my recollection that the debate in the Senate at least left the clear understanding in the minds of Senators, so expressed in the

RECORD, that no such thing could ever happen under the conference report on the bill which was adopted.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I so understand, and that is why I am calling this matter to the attention of the Senate at this time.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Is it not the opinion of the Senator from Minnesota that if there had been any other construction placed upon it, the bill would have been defeated?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. That was generally understood. In a footnote to the dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Black, Mr. Justice Douglas, and Mr. Justice Murphy, there appear the names of Members of the Senate and the House who protested this legislation until they were assured that it would provide direction to the Interstate Commerce Commission not to show any prejudice against the waterways.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I do not wish to interrupt the Senator, but, under the pressure of the legislative situation during the last few weeks, I have not had time to read the opinion. So I should like to ask, How does the majority opinion escape that legislative history?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I shall go into that. As I have said, Senators and Members of the House who showed apprehension and discussed what the Interstate Commerce Commission would do are named in a footnote to the opinion. I quote from it as follows:

The following Senators and Representatives, among others, either required assurance that the Commission would not discriminate against water carriers or expressed the conviction that under the statement of policy, the Commission would be unable to discriminate against water carriers: Senators Austin, Clark of Missouri, Connally, Ellender, Lucas, Miller, McNary, Norris, Pepper, Shipstead, Truman, and Wheeler; Representatives Bland, Bulwinkle, Crosser, Culin, Halleck, Lea, Pierce of Oregon, Sparkman, and Wadsworth.

A case was decided by the Interstate Commerce Commission from which an appeal was taken by the Inland Waterways Corporation. The appeal was to a three-judge court in Chicago, and that court unanimously overruled the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Interstate Commerce Commission appealed to the Supreme Court, and on the 14th day of June the Court rendered a decision in favor of their claim, with Mr. Justice Black, Mr. Justice Douglas, and Mr. Justice Murphy dissenting.

I now give a few words of the history of this case.

On October 15, 1939, the railroads proposed before the Interstate Commerce Commission to do away with all rail proportional rates eastbound from Chicago, on grain moving into Chicago by the Illinois waterway by barges.

A proportional rate had been in effect under which grain moving from Chicago to eastern points had the same rates as grain coming in by lake or rail to Chicago.

This proposal left in effect certain proportional rates from Chicago to certain points in the East located west of a Pittsburgh-Buffalo line on grain coming into Chicago from Illinois points in

any manner, except by barge; second, grain coming into Chicago from the Northwest by rail or lake, and third, grain coming into Chicago by rail from Kansas City and St. Louis.

The proposal was also to kill all proportional rates, eastbound from Chicago, on all grain coming into Chicago by barge from all parts of the West if it was destined to New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, District of Columbia, and all points in New York and Pennsylvania except points in those States west of a Buffalo-Pittsburgh line.

The net result of the decision is to destroy the great bulk of the grain movement on our inland waterways, the savings on which go to the farmers, under the decision of the three-judge court in Chicago. In their decision their finding was that all benefits from this saving through shipping grain by water went to the farmer.

The proposal of the railroads to abandon and to deny to shippers by barge, by the inland waterways, the same proportional rate to the East which grain coming down the Lakes into Chicago by rail would enjoy, was approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission. As a matter of fact, as a result of the decision, it costs 8 cents a hundred pounds more to ship grain to the East if it comes to Chicago by water, than if it comes by rail or down the Lakes.

A majority of the Supreme Court reversed the three-judge court in Chicago, holding, in an involved and highly technical opinion, that in a proper proceeding, presumably with the whole Nation's grain structure and a different record before them, proportional rates on exchange grain might be approved.

The trial of this case, which ended with the Commission and the Supreme Court completely ignoring a specific provision in the 1940 Transportation Act that there should be no discrimination against water carriers in the application of proportional rates, extended from October 15, 1939, to June 14, 1943. It is now back before the Interstate Commerce Commission, presumably for another 4-year controversy. Meanwhile, the farmers are denied low-cost transportation on waterways developed for public use.

Justices Black, Douglas, and Murphy dissented from this decision of the Court, stating that Members of Congress had pointed out when the Transportation Act of 1940 was before them that they feared Interstate Commerce Commission regulation because the Commission was railroad-minded; that the railroads knew how to strangle water carriers by procedural delays and how to profit by such delays, and that this action of the Commission shows that their fears were justified. This dissenting opinion is ruggedly honest in its reasoning, clear in its understanding of the real public issues involved, and expressed in language which the American people can understand. I believe those who have the Nation's welfare at

heart should read the dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Black, and I ask to have printed in the RECORD, following my remarks, the majority opinion of the Supreme Court in the case of Interstate Commerce Commission against Inland Waterways Corporation, and the dissenting opinion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, on June 19 we had an exhibition of how those who publish newspapers and write editorials for the interests which are asking for special consideration and privilege act in speaking for those who sustain their publications. The Traffic World, in its issue of June 19, vents its spleen upon Justices Black, Murphy, and Douglas for their dissenting opinion.

Mr. President, I think the three Justices are to be complimented for being attacked from such a source. To show how these people, when they do not get the kind of decision they want, retaliate upon those who will not go along, I wish to quote from an editorial in the Traffic World. In the editorial there is language attacking Justices of the Supreme Court more violently and reprehensively than I have ever before noted in public print. I quote from the editorial:

If anything were needed to convince thinking people that Justice Black, of the Supreme Court of the United States, is just a cheap demagogue and not a jurist—

This must also apply to the other two dissenting Justices, that is, Justices Murphy and Douglas, because they agreed with Justice Black. The editorial continues:

or to remind those who may have forgotten in the time that has elapsed since President Roosevelt disgracefully appointed him to that distinguished bench—it is furnished by his dissenting opinion in the ex barge grain rate decision. We are not now referring to the righteousness or unrighteousness of his conclusions, but to his reasoning and language, which are those of the small-time politician and not of a learned lawyer.

I call attention to the fact that if that editorial applies to the three Justices of the Supreme Court dissenting, it also applies to the Members of Congress who anticipated what was going to happen if the Transportation Act of 1940 became law, and anticipated what would happen when the matter reached the Interstate Commerce Commission, after having specifically pointed out to the Interstate Commerce Commission that they must not discriminate against waterways.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator will recall that when the bill which became the Transportation Act of 1940 was under consideration in this body, some of us stood on this floor for 3 days—I know the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Wisconsin did, and I know I did, and I know of several other Senators who did—and pointed out specifically the construction likely to be put

upon the law by railroad-minded Interstate Commerce Commissioners, if we passed the bill in its then shape. It was vehemently and specifically denied for 3 days on this floor that any such construction was possible. I remember the representative of the Interstate Commerce Commission sitting right here on the floor next to the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], the chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and supplying him with denials that it was even remotely possible that such a construction could be put on the act as has actually been put on it. In my judgment, the measure could not have been passed through this body, or through the Congress, and probably would not have been signed by the President, except for those vehement denials as to the possibility of any such construction.

We charged then that what has happened would happen; that the Interstate Commerce Commission, a railroad-minded body, would deliberately start out to destroy all efforts at water transportation. The Senate saw fit to believe protestations which were made against any possibility of such an occurrence, but what we predicted has unfortunately and lamentably come to pass.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. With respect to the statement that representatives of the Interstate Commerce Commission sat beside me and told me what was in the bill, let me say that I think I knew what was in the bill, because long and protracted hearings were held on it in the committee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield again?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me say that I did not mean to say that they were putting words in the mouth of the Senator from Montana, but they were speaking with the voice of the Interstate Commerce Commission to the Senator from Montana, and through him to the Senate. I did not mean to say that they were putting words in the Senator's mouth. I know he always speaks for himself.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me say that we did provide in the bill, and it was my understanding, that transportation by water, by truck, and every other kind of transportation would be taken into consideration by the Interstate Commerce Commission. I am as much opposed to the ruling which the Interstate Commerce Commission has made with respect to this matter as is the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am very certain that is true, and I am glad the Senator from Montana made the statement, because that has been his position at all times.

Mr. WHEELER. That was my position then, and it is my position now. The ruling of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the ruling of the Supreme Court are both contrary to the

construction which I have placed on the law and the construction which I told the Senate would be placed on the law.

I wish to say that I wanted the regulation to be made by the Interstate Commerce Commission, because I thought that Commission would at all times provide for rates to be fixed according to the inherent advantages of the different forms of transportation. As the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] knows, we have been holding hearings for the last 2 months upon proposed legislation to regulate the traffic bureaus of the country. Representatives of the Department of Justice have been heard at great length on the matter, and so have representatives of the railroads. We have not as yet concluded the hearings. They will be taken up again at the conclusion of the recess of Congress. I am hopeful that the Interstate Commerce Commission will recognize the inherent advantage of different forms of transportation. I will say that I have been disappointed by some of the rulings made by the Commission in permitting truck and bus rates to be raised to the level of railroad freight rates.

There is a concerted effort now being made to permit railroads to get into the truck and bus business. When Congress reconvenes after the recess I intend to introduce proposed legislation to prevent railroads from owning busses and trucks. I think the railroad business should be divorced from the bus and truck business. I think the express companies, which are owned by the railroads, should not be permitted to engage in the trucking business. I think the railroads should not be in the trucking business; I think the railroads should not be in the water transportation business, and I think they should not own air transportation facilities.

I know the idea exists in the minds of many persons in this country that all forms of transportation should be owned by one group. If that ever happens we will have no competition in transportation in the United States. I shall oppose any such movement with all my strength.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota permit me to make one comment on the statement made by the Senator from Montana?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am very happy indeed to hear the statement made by the Senator from Montana. It seems to me that until such time as we come to a system of monopolistic control, under which a man could go to an office at Helena, Mont., or Bowling Green, Mo., or Madison, Wis., or Bismarck, N. Dak., or any place else, and ask one responsible official what was the cheapest way for him to transport a bill of goods from one point to any place on the habitable globe, and have it routed by the cheapest possible route, whether by air, by rail, or by water, or part water, and part air, and part rail—a sort of monopolistic control which would necessarily mean Government ownership, as I see it—I say, Mr. Presi-

dent, until we come to such a time as that there ought to be the completest competition and separation between these various forms of transportation.

I am particularly glad that the Senator from Montana has mentioned in his discussion the matter of air transportation. I happen to be the chairman of the Subcommittee on Civil Aviation of the Committee on Commerce. That committee has been holding some hearings, not public hearings, but preliminary hearings, for the purpose of forming committee views as to policy on post-war aviation. I find that the interoceanic steamship companies and the railroads are already prepared to move in and try to take possession of the vast field of development which will unquestionably take place in aviation when the war is over. I say that is completely wrong. I do not think that the steamship companies, or the railroad companies, or truck companies should be permitted to participate in the development of aviation as a transportation field any more than I think the railroads should be permitted to dominate the water carriers, or truck transportation, or vice versa.

It seems to me that in the decisions on the part of the Interstate Commerce Commission, to which the Senator from Minnesota has been referring, sustained, unfortunately, by the Supreme Court of the United States, the Commission is flouting the theory of the necessity for the utmost competition between various forms of transportation until such time, if it ever comes, as the Government, in its wisdom, may conclude to take over all forms of transportation and operate them as a Government monopoly.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee whether it is not true that frequently the directors of railroads do not own any stock until a day or two before they are elected directors? Is it not true that often a clerk in some office, for example, is picked out as a director of a railroad?

Mr. WHEELER. I do not think it is true that the railroads pick out clerks for such positions. I think it will be found that most directors of railroads are either connected with some large industry or belong to some banking concern in the city of New York.

Mr. LANGER. That is what I had reference to. Some clerk in a banking house is picked to be a director of a railroad.

Mr. WHEELER. So far as I know, clerks in banking houses are not picked for such positions. Directors or officers of banking houses are often chosen as directors of railroads. I do not know of any instance of a clerk in a banking house being picked as a director. There may be such instances, but I do not know of any.

Mr. LANGER. The Northern Pacific Railroad traverses both the States of Montana and North Dakota. I understand that some of its directors own only

5 or 10 shares of stock in the railroad, and that some of them hold very minor positions in other concerns.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not have much doubt that that may be true. I think that is true with respect to every corporation of any size in the United States. Often directors of corporations hold only a sufficient number of shares to qualify as directors.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator said he was going to introduce proposed legislation later in the year. In that connection, let me ask the Senator why the State of Montana or the State of North Dakota, for example, should not have two or three directors on the board of a railroad which traverses those States?

Let me say that sometime ago, after extended hearings, the North Dakota State Railroad Commission reduced the intrastate rate from Minot to Edgeley \$100 per car of wheat. The distance between those two towns is a little over 100 miles. If a farmer or other citizen of North Dakota or of Montana had been a director of the railroad he would years ago have discovered the situation which existed concerning high interstate rates. It seems to me the public should have some representation on the board of directors of the railroads.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that I think the States traversed by the railroads should have representatives on the boards of directors of the railroads. One of the troubles with the railroads, and one which Mr. Jesse Jones commented on, either publicly or before our committee, is that the directors and officers have to spend too much time traveling back and forth to New York to see their bankers, to find out what should be done. There is no question in my mind that such a situation is undesirable. For instance, the Southern Pacific Railroad operates almost entirely on the Pacific coast, but its main offices were maintained in New York City, and at one time most of the directors and officers were living in New York City.

Those who operate a railroad should be familiar with the territory through which the railroad passes, and some of the members of the board of directors should know something about conditions in the States traversed by the railroad.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator whether in his judgment the members of the boards of directors of the railroads should be appointed by a State agency, or whether there should be some similar arrangement.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not know whether that should be done; because if they were appointed by a State agency, there might be some difficulty. If a State agency were to take over the railroads, there would be conflicting interests between the States, and I am not in favor of that.

Mr. LANGER. I mean the members of the board of directors.

Mr. WHEELER. Let us consider the Northern Pacific Railroad, for instance. On its board of directors there would have to be at least one member from every State traversed by the line.

Mr. LANGER. That would mean only five or six.

Mr. WHEELER. I am not sure that would be a feasible arrangement. I think that someone from the States traversed by the railroad or someone who knows something about conditions in those States should be on the board of directors.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, let me say that the Senator from Montana worked hard for the enactment of the Transportation Act of 1940, and I am sure he worked in good faith to protect the waterways. Mr. Eastman appeared before our committee and discussed the bill at length, including the waterway provision. Of course, we assumed he spoke for the Commission.

However, when the decision of the Interstate Commerce Commission came to be made in this case, certainly Mr. Eastman did not speak for the Commission, because he dissented. He dissented, because he favored the legislation. We had assumed that when he appeared before the committee he spoke for the Commission. Commissioners Porter, Alldredge, and Johnson also dissented.

To show the arrogance of the Commission in its action on the matter, I quote from the statement of the attorney representing the railroad interests who made the proposal to the Interstate Commerce Commission:

We made this proposal, as I have stated several times, and filed these tariffs, with the hope that we could drive this business off the water and back onto the rails where it belongs. We are not in love with water transportation. We believe that we are entitled to that grain business.

Well, Mr. President, they got their way with the Interstate Commerce Commission.

As a result, the Commission said in its decision that the new rate is now to be imposed on grain which, following arrival at Chicago after shipment from the Northwest and Central West by means of barge on the Illinois waterway, is shipped by rail to the East. The result of the Commission's decision and the Supreme Court's opinion is that grain which has arrived at Chicago after shipment by barge on the Illinois waterway will be subjected to a rate $8\frac{1}{2}$ cents higher, when shipped by rail to the East, than will grain which has arrived at Chicago by lake steamer or by rail. The Interstate Commerce Commission may have the view that the rate is not a prohibitive one; but who will ship grain by way of the Illinois waterway, and subsequently have to pay a rail rate $8\frac{1}{2}$ cents higher, rather than ship the grain to Chicago by all-rail or all-lake steamer transportation, in the first place?

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, let me say that, of course, the rate is a prohibitive one, because before our committees the experts have testified that the regulation of freight tariffs on wheat is such a delicate matter that even a difference of half a cent may determine how the grain is to be shipped.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Yes; but in the present case there is a differential of more than 8 cents.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course, I say that is prohibitive.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. But the interstate Commerce Commission says it is not prohibitive. The Commission means that people can ship grain, anyway. However, the result is that grain is not shipped in that way and will not be shipped in that way.

Hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent on the inland waterways and the intercoastal and intracoastal waterways; but all efforts made in that connection now are being thwarted and the legislation passed by Congress for those purposes is now being emasculated by a decision of an agency of Congress, sustained by a majority opinion of the Supreme Court.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he concludes?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I hope the Senator from Montana, the chairman of the powerful Interstate Commerce Committee, the Senator from Minnesota, and other Senators who are interested in the matter will make it the first order of business after the recess, and that a concerted effort will be made to reverse the flagrant violation of the legislative intent of Congress committed by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I think all the other members of the committee, in addition to the chairman, will be very much interested in an endeavor of that kind. Such an effort certainly should be made. I think the Commission's action is one of the most flagrant violations of good faith, as well as a violation of an act of Congress. After we had obtained assurances from sources upon which it was thought reliance could be placed that such a decision would not be rendered, those assurances were completely ignored.

EXHIBIT I

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES—NO. 175—OCTOBER TERM, 1942—THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION, THE BALTIMORE AND OHIO RAILROAD CO. ET AL., APPELLANTS, V. INLAND WATERWAYS CORPORATION ET AL.—ON APPEAL FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS—JUNE 14, 1943

(Mr. Justice Jackson delivered the opinion of the Court.)

By schedules filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission to become effective October 15, 1939, the appellant eastern railroads sought to deny grain arriving at Chicago by barge over the Illinois Waterways the privilege of moving out of Chicago by rail on "proportional" rates applicable to competing grain arriving at Chicago by lake steamer or rail. The only other rates on which the ex-barge grain could move eastward by rail from Chicago were "local" rates, which were in all cases higher than the existing "proportional" rates. The proposed schedules were protested by barge lines and others desirous of maintaining the existing proportionals as to ex-barge grain.

¹ Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., New York Central Railroad Co., New York, Chicago & St. Louis Railroad Co., Pennsylvania Railroad Co., Erie Railroad Co., and the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co.

Understanding of the controversy thus precipitated and the consequent litigation which has brought it to this Court requires a statement of the rather complicated rate structure to which the proposed schedules related.

The proposed schedules applied to grain, grain products and grain byproducts, but for convenience we refer to them all as "grain." They dealt not only with grain coming by barge via the Illinois Waterways to Chicago, but also with grain so arriving at Peoria, Ill., St. Louis, Mo., and other related rate-break points. Chicago is illustrative of all, and for convenience we shall follow the practice employed by the parties in briefs and argument, and confine our discussion to it.

Grain originating at Chicago, grain brought there by truck, or by rail under intrastate rates, and grain which had forfeited its transit privileges, moved eastward by rail from Chicago on local rates. Their validity as such has not been questioned in this case.

Grain originating at certain places distant from Chicago had the privilege, however, of moving eastward from Chicago by rail on the lower proportional rates, although it came to rest at Chicago for marketing or processing. These "proportionals" varied according to the region of origin or the region of destination; and, in some instances, according to both.

Official territory lies east of Chicago and is divided into central territory, trunk-line territory, and New England territory. Central territory lies west of a line drawn through Pittsburgh and Buffalo. To this territory there were three different sets of proportionals, set with reference to the territory of origin.

Grain originating at certain points in Illinois moved out of Chicago by rail to central territory on Illinois reshipping proportionals, which, however, did not apply to ex-barge grain and were not affected by the proposed schedules.

Grain originating in northwest territory moved out of Chicago by rail to central territory on northwest proportionals, which were in some instances higher, and in others lower, than the Illinois reshipping proportionals. As first published, these proportionals applied only to grain originating in northwest territory, which comprises generally North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin, the Upper Peninsula of Michigan, Montana, Wyoming, Idaho, Oregon, Washington, and certain Canadian provinces. The northwest proportionals were originally and have continued to be applicable on grain arriving at Chicago by lake.

In 1932 the northwest proportionals were amended to make them apply to shipments which "arrived by boat line at Chicago * * *". At the time this wording was put into the tariffs the only water-borne grain to which they applied was that arriving from the northwest by boat over the Great Lakes. The Commission has decided that the effect of this amendment was to make the northwest proportionals apply to grain arriving by barge over the Illinois waterways, which were opened in the following year, 1933; and we accept its determination of this issue. While shipping points along the waterways vary from 57.5 to 200.9 miles in distance from Chicago, some grain arriving there by barge originated at points as far beyond as Kansas City and St. Louis. The northwest proportionals were the only ones which applied to ex-barge grain moving out of Chicago by rail to central territory, and the proposed schedules canceled them as to such grain.

Grain brought by rail from trans-Mississippi territory which included, among other places, Kansas City and St. Louis, moved out of Chicago to central territory on trans-Mississippi proportionals, which had been

set by the Commission 3 cents lower than the northwest proportionals, in order to equalize the Twin Cities with Kansas City. The trans-Mississippi proportionals did not apply to grain coming from these points by barge, and therefore such grain had to pay a higher rate for the outbound haul than was required of grain coming from them by rail. No complaint has been made, however, of this; and the appellees have been content to assert that they are entitled to the northwest proportionals as to such grain.

"Trunk-line territory" lies between Central territory and New England territory, which comprises the New England States. To trunk-line and New England territories the proportionals did not vary with the point of origin of the grain. These proportionals applied to grain coming to Chicago by barge over the Illinois waterways, and the proposed schedules canceled them as to such grain. The existing schedules provided that "in no case shall the combination through rate to and from the reshipping point via rail be less than the local rate from the reshipping point to destination, the difference necessary to protect the local rate from the reshipping point to be added to the reshipping rate therefrom." No such provision was made with respect to the barge-rail traffic, and the Commission found accordingly that "the barge-rail rates are far below the local rates from the reshipping points in contravention of the fourth-section rule," while the all-rail rates are in strict conformity with that rule."

When the proposed schedules were filed with the Commission, that body, acting pursuant to its authority under section 15 (7) of the act,⁴ suspended them for the allowable

period of 7 months and entered upon a hearing of their lawfulness. The last testimony was heard, and the record in the case closed, on January 26, 1940. On September 18, 1940, the President approved the Transportation Act of 1940.⁵ Thereafter the appellee Inland

the commission shall have, and it is hereby given, authority, either upon complaint or upon its own initiative without complaint, at once, and if it so orders without answer or other formal pleading by the interested carrier or carriers, but upon reasonable notice, to enter upon a hearing concerning the lawfulness of such rate, fare, charge, classification, regulation, or practice; and pending such hearing and the decision thereon the commission, upon filing with such schedule and delivering to the carrier or carriers affected thereby a statement in writing of its reasons for such suspension, may from time to time suspend the operation of such schedule and defer the use of such rate, fare, charge, classification, regulation, or practice, but not for a longer period than 7 months beyond the time when it would otherwise go into effect; and after full hearing, whether completed before or after the rate, fare, charge, classification, regulation, or practice goes into effect, the commission may make such order with reference thereto as would be proper in a proceeding initiated after it had become effective. If the proceeding has not been concluded and an order made within the period of suspension, the proposed change of rate, fare, charge, classification, regulation, or practice shall go into effect at the end of such period; but in case of a proposed increased rate or change for or in respect to the transportation of property, the commission may by order require the interested carrier or carriers to keep accurate account in detail of all amounts received by reason of such increase, specifying by whom and in whose behalf such amounts are paid, and upon completion of the hearing and decision may by further order require the interested carrier, or carriers to refund, with interest, to the persons in whose behalf such amounts were paid, such portion of such increased rates or charges as by its decision shall be found not justified. At any hearing involving a change in a rate, fare, charge, or classification, or in a rule, regulation, or practice, after September 18, 1940, the burden of proof shall be upon the carrier to show that the proposed change, rate, fare, charge, classification, rule, regulation, or practice is just and reasonable, and the commission shall give to the hearing and decision of such questions preference over all other questions pending before it and decide the same as speedily as possible.

"The provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act particularly relied upon by appellees which were amended or added by the Transportation Act of 1940 read as follows:

"It is hereby declared to be the national transportation policy of the Congress to provide for fair and impartial regulation of all modes of transportation subject to the provisions of this act, so administered as to recognize and preserve the inherent advantages of each; to promote safe, adequate, economical, and efficient service and foster sound economic conditions in transportation and among the several carriers; to encourage the establishment and maintenance of reasonable charges for transportation services, without unjust discrimination, undue preferences or advantages, or unfair or destructive competitive practices; to cooperate with the several States and the duly authorized officials thereof; and to encourage fair wages and equitable working conditions—all to the end of developing, coordinating, and preserving a national transportation system by water, highway, and rail, as well as other means, adequate to meet the needs of the commerce of the United

Waterways Corporation requested the Commission to dispose of the proceeding in the light of the new act. On July 31, 1941, Division 2 of the Commission found that "the proportional rates here in issue have never been applicable on this barge traffic moving on unfilled rates," and that "the schedules under suspension are not shown to be unlawful." It announced that an order would be entered vacating the already expired order of suspension and discontinuing the proceedings.⁶ When the period of compulsory suspension ended, the carriers had voluntarily continued the suspension.

In its petition for rehearing and reconsideration of this report the Inland Waterways Corporation asserted that the Commission had permitted discrimination against a connecting line forbidden by section 3 (4) of the Interstate Commerce Act as amended by the Transportation Act of 1940.⁷ It suggested that the Commission fix the existing proportional rates as the proper ones, stating that: "Theoretically, the Commission is not limited to a choice between the unlawful proposed rates and the present rates, but may, upon an adequate record, prescribe some different basis of rates for the future. Actually, no different proposal has been introduced which could support a different basis of rates than those presently in effect. That fact, however, cannot possibly militate to justify the proposed rates, but could only compel the post-

States, of the Postal Service, and of the national defense. All of the provisions of this act shall be administered and enforced with a view to carrying out the above declaration of policy." (54 Stat. 899.)

"Sec. 3 (1). It shall be unlawful for any common carrier subject to the provisions of this part to make, give, or cause any undue or unreasonable preference or advantage to any particular person, company, firm, corporation, association, locality, port, port district, gateway, transit point, region, district, territory, or any particular description of traffic, in any respect whatsoever; or to subject any particular person, company, firm, corporation, association, locality, port, port district, gateway, transit point, region, district, territory, or any particular description of traffic to any undue or unreasonable prejudice or disadvantage in any respect whatsoever: *Provided, however,* That this paragraph shall not be construed to apply to discrimination, prejudice, or disadvantage to the traffic of any other carrier of whatever description" (54 Stat. 902, 49 U. S. C., sec. 3 (1)).

"Sec. 3 (4). All carriers subject to the provisions of this part shall, according to their respective powers, afford all reasonable, proper, and equal facilities for the interchange of traffic between their respective lines and connecting lines, and for the receiving, forwarding, and delivering of passengers or property to and from connecting lines; and shall not discriminate in their rates, fares, and charges between connecting lines, or unduly prejudice any connecting line in the distribution of traffic that is not specifically routed by the shipper. As used in this paragraph, the term 'connecting line' means the connecting line of any carrier subject to the provisions of this part or any common carrier by water subject to part III" (54 Stat. 903, 49 U. S. C., sec. 3 (4)).

"Part III, section 304 (c). * * * Differences in the classifications, rates, fares, charges, rules, regulations, and practices of a water carrier in respect of water transportation from those in effect by a rail carrier with respect to rail transportation shall not be deemed to constitute unjust discrimination, prejudice, or disadvantage, or an unfair or destructive competitive practice, within the meaning of any provision of this act" (54 Stat. 935, 49 U. S. C., sec. 905 (c)).

⁴ 246 I. C. C. 353.

⁵ See footnote 4, supra, for the text of this provision.

⁴ Sec. 4. (1) It shall be unlawful for any common carrier subject to this part or part III to charge or receive any greater compensation in the aggregate for the transportation of passengers, or of like kind of property, for a shorter than for a longer distance over the same line or route in the same direction, the shorter being included within the longer distance or to charge any greater compensation as a through rate than the aggregate of the intermediate rates subject to the provisions of this part or part III, but this shall not be construed as authorizing any common carrier within the terms of this part or part III to charge or receive as great compensation for a shorter as for a longer distance: *Provided,* That upon application to the Commission such common carrier may in special cases, after investigation, be authorized by the Commission to charge less for longer than for shorter distances for the transportation of passengers or property; and the Commission may from time to time prescribe the extent to which such designated common carrier may be relieved from the operation of this section, but in exercising the authority conferred upon it in this proviso the Commission shall not permit the establishment of any charge to or from the more distant point that is not reasonably compensatory for the service performed; and no such authorization shall be granted on account of merely potential water competition not actually in existence: *And provided further,* That tariffs proposing rates subject to the provisions of this paragraph may be filed when application is made to the Commission under the provisions hereof, and in the event such application is approved, the Commission shall permit such tariffs to become effective upon 1 day's notice (54 Stat. 904, 49 U. S. C., sec. 4 (1)).

⁵ 44 Stat. 1447 as amended by 54 Stat. 912, 49 U. S. C. sec. 15 (7), reading:

"Whenever there shall be filed with the commission any schedule stating a new individual or joint rate, fare, or charge, or any new individual or joint classification, or any new individual or joint regulation or practice affecting any rate, fare, or charge,

ponement of any change in the present tariffs pending further hearing, and the introduction of a lawful proposal."

The decision of the whole Commission on reconsideration was announced on December 1, 1941.⁸ In it the Commission took official notice that certain of the protestant barge carriers had attained common carrier status under the act, and stated that "no useful purpose would be served by further hearing or reargument."⁹ The Commission reviewed the existing rate structure and the probable effects of the proposed changes in operation as contrasted to the effects of denying them, and said:

"The proposed schedules will not prohibit the movement by barge-rail even to trunk-line territory, their principal commercial effects being to reduce the profits of the Chicago elevator operators. * * *

"Protestants maintain that the proposed schedules will be unreasonable, unjustly discriminatory, and unduly prejudicial * * * and unduly preferential * * * This is based primarily on the fact that under the proposed schedules the ex-barge rates will be higher than the ex-rail or ex-lake rates, although in each instance the physical carriage beyond the reshipping point is substantially the same. But the latter is also true of local grain, grain brought in by truck, or by rail under intrastate rates, or grain which has forfeited its transit privileges. To adopt protestants' premise would mean that all proportional rates lower than local rates and differing from each other according to the origin of the commodity would have to be condemned. As pointed out by the division, reshipping or proportional rates are in their essence balances of through rates. Such balances are, of course, determined by the measure of the in-bound and through rates and properly may vary according to the relative length and nature of the in-bound and through service. It follows that the protestants' allegations cannot be sustained in this proceeding, although in a proper proceeding we might

⁸ Petitions for reconsideration were also filed by "Chicago protestants," operating elevators and dealing in grain at Chicago; Illinois Agricultural Association, representing shippers located on the Illinois waterways; Finnegan Warehouse Co., operating an elevator on the waterways; and the United States Department of Agriculture. These petitions are not incorporated in the record, but it appears that the action of Division 2 was assailed by these protestants under sec. 3 (1), set out in footnote 4.

⁹ 248 I. C. C. 307.

¹⁰ From the report of the Commission it appears that the Inland Waterways Corporation was the only one asking further hearings. It stated that further hearings could be useful only to establish the information of which the Commission took official notice, and suggested that the Commission avoid the necessity for them by taking such notice.

¹¹ Even under the proposed schedules, the combination barge-rail rates are in many instances lower than the all-rail rates. Much grain that arrives at Chicago is consumed locally or is shipped out by lake. In the case of grain arriving by rail, such disposition often leaves the elevator with a "transit balance" as a result of which ex-barge grain may move eastward by rail on the proportional rates.

The district court apparently did not find that there was no evidence to support the Commission's finding that it was the elevator operator, rather than the farmer, who is affected by the proposed schedules. In any event, the foregoing would seem sufficient support for the Commission's finding, and we do not suppose that the finding makes any difference in the law to be applied.

prescribe proportional rates on the ex-barge traffic lower than local rates or joint barge-rail rates lower than the combinations.

"The facts of record, as detailed by the division and summarized herein, clearly show that respondents are justified under section 1 in treating the ex-barge traffic the same as local or ex-truck traffic and that the proposed schedules cannot be condemned as unlawful under sections 2 and 3 of the act.

"On reconsideration of the record in the light of the petitions and replies thereto and our prior decisions, we find that:

"(1) The proportional rates here under consideration were legally applicable on the ex-barge traffic where the so-called policing provisions were strictly complied with.

"(2) The proposed schedules are shown to be just and reasonable and are not shown to be otherwise unlawful."

Accordingly the Commission ordered:

"That the order heretofore entered in this proceeding, suspending the operation of the schedules enumerated and described in said order, be, and it is hereby, vacated and set aside as of December 22, 1941, and that this proceeding be discontinued."

After the Commission had announced its decision and on December 12, 1941, appellant Mechling Barge Lines sought to intervene on the ground that since the record had been closed it had become a regular common carrier by water of grain by barge to Chicago and other rate-break points, and was entitled to the protection afforded to such carriers by the Transportation Act of 1940. It urged that the decision be set aside and, if it should be thought necessary to this end, that it be given an opportunity to introduce evidence. This was the first offer to assist the Commission in any way in the establishment of proportional rates fixed with reference to the ex-barge grain. No specific suggestion was made, however, as to the amount of such rates or as to the evidence which would be introduced in support. This petition was denied by the Commission on January 21, 1942.

On January 16, 1942, the Inland Waterways Corporation had filed its complaint in the United States district court seeking an injunction against the enforcement of the Commission's order. Various other parties were allowed to intervene in the case as plaintiffs and defendants. The Attorney General did not participate, giving as his reason the existence of a conflict in litigation between coordinate agencies of the Government, the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, and the Interstate Commerce Commission. The opinion of the specially constituted three-judge district court was announced on April 16, 1942.¹¹ It stated that:

"The Interstate Commerce Commission took no evidence addressed to the issue whether the rate proposal in question is in violation of section 3(4) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended by the Transportation Act of 1940, or contrary to the national transportation policy enacted by the last said act; but the Interstate Commerce Commission passed upon the legality of said rate proposal upon evidence taken without reference to such issues and before they existed." It concluded that the order was of a "character which this Court is authorized to enjoin and set aside," and should be set aside on the ground that it "discriminates against water competition by the users of barges." It decreed that the Commission's order vacating the already-expired suspension of the proposed schedules and discontinuing the proceedings be annulled and that the railroads be "permanently enjoined * * * from acting upon the authority of the aforesaid order."

¹² 44 F. Supp. 368.

The case is here on appeal.¹²

In the proceedings before the commission the protestants pitched their case upon two propositions: (1) To deny the ex-barge grain the benefit of proportionals sought to be canceled was necessarily unlawful since the physical carriage beyond Chicago was substantially the same, no matter where the grain originated; (2) since denial of that benefit was necessarily unlawful, the Commission was bound to maintain the status quo by canceling the proposed schedules and thus perpetuating the existing rate structure, whatever might be its defects.

As the Commission correctly observed with reference to the first contention, "to adopt protestants' premise would mean that all proportional rates lower than local rates and differing from each other according to the origin of the commodity would have to be condemned."

Proportional rates so differing and lower than local rates for like outbound transportation have a long history, antedating the Interstate Commerce Act itself. Long hauls have generally been thought entitled to move at a rate less than the sum of the rates for local or short hauls between intermediate points. The practice of routing commodities such as grain to centers for marketing and processing has been widespread and often a necessary feature of the process of distribution. In many instances stop-overs for marketing and processing have not been considered as disrupting the continuity of transportation to more distant points, and consequently the grain has been allowed to move on at a rate lower than the out-bound rate on grain originating locally and not from a distance.¹³ To get the outbound business competing carriers frequently would offer rates similarly computed.¹⁴ Proportional rates established on this reasoning¹⁵ have become deeply embedded in the transportation system of the country, and have been approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission,¹⁶ by the Federal courts, this one included;¹⁷ and, so far as it has spoken on the subject, by Congress itself.¹⁸ We see no reason for repudiating them now.

Having pointed out the error of the protestants' basic contention, the Commission stated that "It follows that the protestants' allegations cannot be sustained in this proceeding, although in a proper proceeding we might prescribe proportional rates on this ex-barge traffic lower than local rates or joint barge-rail rates lower than the combinations." Pending the commencement of such a proceeding it ordered the vacation of the already-expired order of suspension and ordered the discontinuance of the instant proceedings.

Despite this statement, much of the argument in this court has proceeded upon the

¹³ Urgent Deficiencies Act of October 22, 1913, 38 Stat. 208, 219-220, 28 U. S. C. secs. 47, 47a; sec. 238 of the Judicial Code as amended, 28 U. S. C. sec. 345.

¹⁴ E. g., *Unlawful Rates in Trans. Cotton* by K. C. M. & B. R. R. Co. (8 I. C. C. 121); *Central Yellow Pine Association v. V. S. & P. R. Co.* (10 I. C. C. 193).

¹⁵ Berry, *A Study of Proportional Rates*, 10 I. C. C. Practitioner's Journal 545, 602.

¹⁶ For the variety of practices so sustained, see Locklin, *Economics of Transportation* (1935), pp. 122-123, 629-631.

¹⁷ See the dissenting opinion of Chairman Eastman in the present case. Other cases are collected in Berry, *supra*, footnote 14.

¹⁸ *Atchison, T. & S. F. Ry. Co. v. United States* (279 U. S. 768); *Great Northern Ry. Co. v. Sullivan* (294 U. S. 458); cf. *Board of Trade v. United States* (314 U. S. 534).

¹⁹ Sec. 11 of the Panama Canal Act, 1912, 37 Stat. 566, now 49 U. S. C., sec. 6 (11), set out in its present form in footnote 23, *infra*. Cf. S. Rept. No. 433, 76th Cong., 1st sess., p. 10.

assumption that the Commission's order resulted from its belief and findings that the discrepancies between the proportional rates not canceled in the proposed schedules and the local rates as applied to ex-barge grain were in all respects lawful, and that it actually approved or prescribed a rate structure containing such discrepancies. We do not so understand the action of the Commission.

True, the Commission stated that the railroads "are justified under section 1 in treating the ex-barge traffic the same as local or ex-truck traffic," and found that "the proposed schedules are shown to be just and reasonable." But this does not constitute a finding that the rates were lawful; they "may lie within the zone of reasonableness and yet result in undue prejudice" or otherwise violate the act.¹⁹ The Commission also stated that the facts of record show that "the proposed schedules cannot be condemned as unlawful under sections 2 and 3 of the act."²⁰ But this statement followed immediately upon the Commission's statement that from its conclusion that protestants' claim as a matter of right to the existing proportionals was erroneous, "It follows that the protestants' allegations cannot be sustained in this proceeding, although in a proper proceeding we might prescribe proportional rates on the ex-barge traffic lower than local rates or joint barge-rail rates lower than the combinations." Read in the context, we think it meant only that the proposed schedules could not be struck down upon the erroneous view advanced by the protestants. The finding of the Commission that the proposed schedules "are not shown to be otherwise unlawful" is, we think, to be similarly read. This form of finding has been held by the Commission not to constitute an approval or a prescription of the rates under suspension.²¹ Since the Commission refused to approve or prescribe them, they stand only as carrier-made rates which, under the Commission's decisions, leaves them open to possible recovery of reparations.²² Like the Commission, we also refrain from approving or prescribing them.

The case had been developed before the Commission upon the theory that the proposed schedules must stand or fall in their entirety. There has been no suggestion, nor

is it apparent, that it would have been feasible for the Commission to pick and choose among the items in the existing and proposed schedules.

To perpetuate the existing rate structure by sustaining the district court's injunction would entail numerous and serious violations of section 4 (1).²³ Under that rate structure, ex-barge grain moved from Illinois River points to Baltimore, New York, and Boston at combination rates lower than the local rates for domestic grain from all points in central territory west of a line running south from Bay City, Mich., through Fort Wayne and Indianapolis, Ind. So also did the ex-barge grain move out at combination rates lower than local export rates on grain from all points in central territory west of a line running southwardly and south along the Indiana-Ohio line; and lower than the local export rates on corn from all points in central territory west of a line between Paynesville and East Liverpool, Ohio, near the Pennsylvania line. Unlike the barge-rail rate, the all-rail rates are, as the Commission has found, in strict conformity with section 4 (1). Congress by the Transportation Act of 1940 amended section 4 (1), but nowhere in the Act or in its legislative history is there any suggestion that from the mere fact that grain moving from beyond Chicago to New York travels by barge for the 60-mile leg of its journey to Chicago—less than 1 percent of the total haul—it shall as matter of law be entitled to a rate from beyond Chicago to the seaboard less than that from the Pennsylvania line to the seaboard.²⁴

Appellees make no better showing with respect to the effect of the injunction on the rate structure west of Chicago. To sustain the injunction would require a holding that grain originating 60 miles from Chicago must as matter of law be given the benefit of proportionals fixed with reference to grain from the Northwest territory, embracing points in Canada and as far west in the United States as Washington and the Dakotas. In addition to the disparity in distances, there is the further fact that the grain from the Northwest is predominately wheat, while that from the territory served by the barge lines is predominately corn from Illinois. Nothing in the Interstate Commerce Act as amended by the Transportation Act of 1940, or in the statements of even the most ardent congressional champions of water transportation, affords the slightest warrant for a decision that the Commission must treat as legally identical such widely disparate factual situations.

Finally it is claimed that the Commission was obliged to continue the section 15 (7) proceedings and establish special proportionals for the barge lines under section 6 (11) of the act.²⁵ This duty is claimed by

¹⁹ See footnote 2, supra, for the text.

²⁰ Indeed, the legislative history shows that the water interests vigorously championed the long-and-short-haul clause as a measure necessary to prevent ruinous competition.

²¹ Sec. 6 (11) provides:

"When property may be or is transported from point to point in the United States by rail and water through the Panama Canal or otherwise, the transportation being by a common carrier or carriers, and not entirely within the limits of a single State, the Interstate Commerce Commission shall have jurisdiction of such transportation and of the carriers, both by rail and by water, which may or do engage in the same, in the following particulars, in addition to the jurisdiction otherwise given by this chapter:

"* * * (b) To establish proportional rates or maximum, or minimum, or maximum and minimum proportional rates, by rail to and from the ports to which the traffic is brought, or from which it is taken by the water carrier, and to determine to what traffic

appellees to derive from the provision of section 15 (7) that after suspension and hearing of a proposed rate change the Commission may make such order with reference thereto as would be proper in a proceeding initiated after it had become effective. The construction contended for would have the effect either of imposing a practically impossible burden upon the Commission or of making resort to the Commission's powers under section 15 (7) so rare as to make such powers of little practical significance. Suspension cases are very numerous, and in many of them the construction contended for would require the Commission to readjust the entire rate structure of an important section of the country.²⁶ We have already noted the breadth of the rate structure here involved. To require the present proceedings to be continued until proportionals can be set with reference to the barge transportation would hardly be within the intention of Congress, which in terms, made the Commission's power discretionary, and legislated upon the assumption, formed after much experimentation with the period of suspension,²⁷ that suspension cases could normally be carried to completion within 7 months and to that end commanded in section 15 (7) that the Commission shall give to the hearing and decision of such questions preference over all other questions pending before it and decide the same as speedily as possible.

The record had been closed on January 26, 1940, when the last testimony was heard. The Transportation Act of 1940 was not enacted until September 18. At the time the evidence was taken it was not clear whether some of the barge lines operating in the waterway were common carriers, and none had obtained certificates of convenience and necessity from the Commission as now required. They had not filed reports with the Commission from which the results of their own operations might be judged, and they had not filed tariffs showing their rates. All of this has since changed. The

and in connection with what vessels and upon what terms and conditions such rates shall apply. By proportional rates are meant those which differ from the corresponding local rates to and from the port and which apply only to traffic which has been brought to the port or is carried from the port by a common carrier by water." (49 U. S. C., sec. 6 (11).)

²² *Salt from Louisiana Mines to Chicago*, 69 I. C. C. 312, 313. See also, *Livestock to Eastern Destinations*, 156 I. C. C. 498.

²³ In the original form provided by section 12 of the Mann-Elkins Act, 1910, 36 Stat. 539, 552, the period of suspension was not to exceed 120 days, with the proviso that if the hearing could not be concluded within that period the Commission might in its discretion extend the time for a further period not exceeding 6 months. Section 4 of the Commission Division Act, 1917, 40 Stat. 270, 272, provided that until January 1, 1920, Commission approval must be had for the filing of increased rates. By section 418 of the Transportation Act of 1920, 41 Stat. 456, 486, the initial suspension period of 120 days was retained, but the permissible period of further suspension was shortened to 30 days. "The increased size of the Commission and its divisional organization rendered the shortening of the suspension period feasible" (1 *Shafman*, the Interstate Commerce Commission, 203). The Commission was authorized, however, to require the carrier to keep accurate account in detail of all amounts received by reason of an increase going into effect at the end of the period of suspension and to require at the end of the hearing that they be refunded. The present provisions with regard to the Commission's power of suspension and of requiring an accounting were enacted by section 2 of the Mayton-Newfield Act, 1927 (44 Stat. 1446, 1447).

¹⁹ *United States v. Illinois Central R. R. Co.* (263 U. S. 515, 524).

²⁰ Sec. 2, 49 U. S. C. sec. 2, reads as follows:

"If any common carrier subject to the provisions of this chapter shall, directly or indirectly, by any special rate, rebate, drawback, or other device, charge, demand, collect, or receive from any person or persons a greater or less compensation for any service rendered or to be rendered, in the transportation of passengers or property, subject to the provisions of this chapter, than it charges, demands, collects, or receives from any other person or persons for doing for him or them a like and contemporaneous service in the transportation of a like kind of traffic under substantially similar circumstances and conditions, such common carrier shall be deemed guilty of unjust discrimination, which is prohibited and declared to be unlawful."

The pertinent provisions of sec. 2 are set forth in footnote 4, supra.

²¹ *Standard Packing Co. v. Union Pacific R. Co.* (180 I. C. C. 433); *Parkersburg Rig & Reel Co. v. Chicago & N. W. Ry. Co.* (198 I. C. C. 709); *William Kelly Milling Co. v. Atchison, T. & S. F. Ry. Co.* (211 I. C. C. 53); *Kansas City Ice Co. v. Atchison, T. & S. F. Ry. Co.* (215 I. C. C. 616, 619); *Hallfax Coal & Wood Co. v. Atlantic & Y. Ry. Co.* (219 I. C. C. 594); *Moorehead Cotton Mills Co. v. Chesapeake & O. Ry. Co.* (231 I. C. C. 437).

²² See cases cited in footnote 21, supra, *Compare Arizona Grocery Co. v. Atchison, T. & S. F. Ry. Co.*, (284 U. S. 370); 50 *Yale Law Journal* 714.

applicable law has changed. The issues raised by the position of the parties did not call for a fixing of new combination rates, for it was contended barge grain was entitled to the existing proportionals.

The policy provisions of the Transportation Act of 1940, as well as the specific statutory provisions, provide only standards of considerable generality and some overlapping. It requires administration to "recognize and preserve the inherent advantages of each"—rail, water, and motor transport. It also seeks "sound economic conditions" for all kinds of transportation.²³ For more than a year after the enactment of this act, and until after the Commission had finally disposed of the case, appellees showed no disposition to make proposals or to develop a record upon the basis of which the Commission might prescribe rates in view of their particular circumstances, and under the provisions of the act designed with reference to them. Instead they relied upon the erroneous view that they were by law entitled to the fortuitous and in many respects unlawful benefits of the existing rate structure. Their nearly 4 years of litigation have not, however, been in vain, for during all this time they have managed to keep the proposed schedules in abeyance, first, by compulsory suspension for the allowable period of 7 months at the hands of the Commission, then by the railroads' voluntary act at the expiration of that period, and, finally, by the compulsion of the district court's injunction.

Our function does not permit us either to prescribe or approve rates, and our decision carries no implication of approval of any rates here involved. Nor are we at liberty to prescribe general attitudes the Commission must adopt toward the exercise of discretion left to it rather than to courts. We decide only whether the Commission has acted within the power delegated to it by law. We are of opinion that it has and that the decision of the court below must be reversed.

Mr. Justice Rutledge did not participate in the consideration or decision of this case.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES—NO. 175—OCTOBER TERM, 1942—THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION, THE BALTIMORE AND OHIO RAILWAY CO., ET AL., APPELLANTS, V. INLAND WATERWAYS CORPORATION ET AL.—ON APPEAL FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO—JUNE 14, 1943

(Mr. Justice Black dissenting.)

The issue in this case is whether the farmers and shippers of the Middle West can be compelled by the Interstate Commerce Commission and the railroads to use high-priced rail instead of low-priced barge transportation for the shipment of grain to the East. I agree that, in the words of Division 2 of the Commission, "this record is replete with complexities and technicalities" which have almost, but I think not quite, successfully obscured that simple issue. The district court, which held that the Interstate Commerce Commission's order "discriminates against water competition by the users of barges" understood the issue.²⁴ The railroads, which proposed the increase in the cost to barge shippers, also understood the issue as is shown by the frank statement of their representative at the Commission hearing: "We made this proposal, as I have stated several times, and filed these tariffs with the hope that we could drive this business off of the water and back onto the rails where it belongs. . . . We are not in love with water transportation . . . and we believe that we are entitled to that grain business." From behind a verbal camouflage of "complexities and technicalities" there emerges

one single easily understandable question: Rails pick up grain in Chicago which may be brought there by rail, lake transport, or inland waterway barge. Is it lawful for a railroad to deprive midwestern grain farmers and shippers of the benefits of cheap barge transportation by charging a higher tariff for reshipment of grain originally transported to Chicago by barge than the same railroad charges for reshipment of the same grain from Chicago to the same places when the grain is brought to the reshipping point by rail or by lake?

The record shows, and it was admitted at the bar, that barges can by reason of their inherent advantages carry grain more cheaply than railroads. The Commission found that inbound grain barge rates to Chicago ranged from 2.75 to 4.5 cents per hundred pounds for hauls of distances of 57 to 200 miles as contrasted with rail rates for the same distances ranging from 9.5 to 13 cents. Grain can thus be brought to Chicago far more cheaply by barge than by rail. However, only a small proportion of the grain which is sent to Chicago stays in that city, and the new tariff approved by the Commission and by this Court will charge so much more for the shipment of grain to the East when the grain is brought to Chicago by barge than is charged for shipment of grain brought in by rail that this natural advantage of barge transportation will be destroyed. Hereafter it will cost 8.5 cents more to ship ex-barge than ex-rail grain to the East.²⁵ Under the existing rates, a farmer can ship his grain from Kansas City to New York by barge to Chicago and rail from Chicago to New York for 4.625 cents less than if he uses rail transport all the way from Kansas City to New York. Under the new schedule approved today, that differential is wiped out, and he will hereafter pay 3.875 more to ship by barge and rail than if he ships rail all the way. This order in substance gives ex-barge traffic a 4-cent disadvantage where it previously had a 4-cent advantage. Similar penalties are imposed upon shippers who use barge lines in Missouri, Iowa, and Illinois. The Commission, as its sole finding on the impact of the rates on the barge lines, found that the new rates would not prohibit barge shipments. Such a finding is irrelevant. A rate need not be prohibitive to be discriminatory. The new rate is manifestly intended to and will have the effect of transferring most of the barge traffic to the railroads, since shippers will not customarily pay 10 percent more to ship by barge-rail than by rail alone.²⁶

²³ The figure given is the increase in cost of shipment to the best eastern market. The cost varies, depending on the destination of the grain.

²⁴ The new rates for shipment from Chicago to the East, of course, do not prohibit barge shipments to Chicago since the small amount of grain consumed in that city will not be affected by the outgoing rates, and some grain can still be carried to the East by lake transportation for so much of the year as the Lakes are open to traffic.

The Court quotes the finding of the Commission that "the proposed schedules are not prohibitive" and that their principal effect will be to reduce the profits of the Chicago elevator operators. If the schedules operate unfairly, as I think they do, it is immaterial whether the farmers or the elevator operators bear the burden of the unfairness; but the Court in relying on this finding pays little regard to the fact that the court below found as a fact that the saving from barge transportation "accrues to the producer" and "does not accrue to the Chicago elevator operator." Unless the Court is willing, as apparently it is not, to reexamine the evidence and to conclude that the court below is in error, we must take the facts as they are given to us by the district court. In any case, I think the district court was correct.

Certain questions may be put to one side without elaborate discussion. The new rates cannot be justified on a theory of distinction between long and short hauls, since the distances covered are substantially the same whether barge-rail or all-rail transportation is used. The Court asserts that the existing all-rail rates are lawful under the long and short haul clauses, while the existing barge-rail rates are unlawful. But there is nothing in the long and short haul clause which requires that shippers by rail to Chicago from points in Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, and Missouri must be granted a low rate for shipment beyond Chicago which is denied to those who ship into Chicago by barge. Nor is the fact that the rates directly affected by the new tariff are "proportional" of any significance.²⁷ A through rate may be invalid because of one factor only of the combination of rates which make it up, "and that factor may be a proportional rate."²⁸ The only issue to be decided is whether the barge shipper shipping from a given point to Chicago should be given any different proportional rate than rail shippers shipping from the same point to Chicago for equal service out of Chicago, and, for reasons to be set forth below, I find no justification for such a discrimination.²⁹

There is no factual issue here on which we are bound to accept the Commission's judgment as we were in *United States v. Chicago Heights Trucking Co.*, 310 U. S. 344. Here we have a rate revision which can serve no conceivable purpose except to force shippers to use railroads instead of barge lines. Reasonable persons may differ as to the wisdom of such a policy, but not as to the certainty of its result; and, as will be shown, Congress has made the policy judgment and has flatly forbidden the Commission to do what it has done. The situation is similar to *Mitchell v. United States*, 313 U. S. 80, 97, in which the Commission sought to shelter a flatly forbidden discrimination behind the shield of expertise. There, too, we were cited to the Chicago Heights case and our many other decisions upholding the right of administrative agencies to make factual judgments. We replied that "On the facts here presented, there is no room, as the Government properly says, for administrative or expert judgment with respect to practical difficulties. It is enough that the discrimination shown was palpably unjust and forbidden by the act." Such, I think, should be our answer here.

This tariff is an unjust discrimination within the meaning of section 2 of the Interstate Commerce Act, 49 U. S. C. section 2, which prohibits a carrier from demanding a charge either higher or lower than

²⁷ "A through rate is ordinarily lower than the combination of the local rates. When a through rate is made by combination of rates for intermediate distances the rate for the later link in the shipment is, when lower than the local, spoken of as a proportional rate" (*Atchison, T. & S. F. Ry. v. United States*, 279 U. S. 268, 771).

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 776.

²⁹ The Commission and the Court refer to the fact that ex-barge rates are now equal to ex-truck rates. This is irrelevant. If there is a discrimination against truck shippers, the remedy is an improvement of their situation, not a destruction of barge shipping. In the words of Chairman Eastman in his dissenting opinion, "My tentative opinion upon it is that where the movement by truck is from territory from which grain can be moved by rail or by water to Chicago subject to the application of the reshipping rates eastbound, the failure to apply such rates to the grain brought in by truck does result in violation of sections 2 and 3, provided adequate provisions for the identification and policing of such shipments are practicable and enforceable."

²³ See footnote 4, supra.

²⁴ 44 F. Supp. 368, 375.

is charged by any other person for doing for him "a like and contemporaneous service in the transportation of a like kind of traffic under substantially similar circumstances and conditions." Many decisions make clear that this section does in fact require a real equality. *Interstate Commerce Commission v. Baltimore & Ohio Railway Co.*, 225 U. S. 326; *Atchison, T. & S. F. Ry. Co. v. United States*, 279 U. S. 768. The Commission counters with a contention that here there is "a dissimilarity of conditions prior to the rendering of the transportation service for which the charge in issue is assessed."

True there is a difference, if only one, in the conditions prior to the rendering of the service from Chicago to the East. The difference is solely that one class of grain moves in to Chicago by barge and another moves in by other means; and this is a ground not of legitimate distinction, but of unfair discrimination. The discrimination would be no worse if the benefits of the cheap through rates were given only to shippers on a favored railroad coming into Chicago, and not to other shippers by rail (*Atchison, T. & S. F. Ry. Co. v. United States*, supra, 773). Here all circumstances and conditions are substantially similar, and the Court ought to require the Commission to obey the law by following its own previously announced rule in *Chattanooga Packet Co. v. I. C. R. Co.* (33 I. C. C. 384, 392, 393), in which the Commission said: "If carriers are permitted to apply higher rates for the same service on traffic routed over connecting water lines than on traffic via the all-rail connections, they will be in a position to destroy all-water competition and to deprive shippers of the advantage of their location upon navigable waters. . . . We are of the opinion and find that, by restricting their proportional rates to traffic routed over their southern rail connections, defendants are unjustly discriminating against complainant and against shippers who desire to route their goods over complainant's boat line."

The decision of the Commission also violates section 3 (4) of the Interstate Commerce Act, 49 U. S. C. section 3 (4), which under the 1940 amendment to the Interstate Commerce Act is applicable to the appellees, and which forbids carriers to "discriminate in their rates, fares, and charges between connecting lines." This section became applicable to the appellees in the course of the Commission's disposition of this case, but before its opinion was filed. This circumstance is not, as the Commission seems to have supposed, a reason for ignoring the section. No more obvious "discrimination in their rates, fares, and charges" can be imagined, particularly in the light of the general policy of the Transportation Act of 1940.

I think that approval of this tariff is a defiance of the Transportation Act of 1940. 54 Stat. 899. This act declared it to be "the national transportation policy of the Congress to provide for fair and impartial regulation of all modes of transportation subject to the provisions of this act, so administered as to recognize and preserve the inherent advantages of each." Title I, section 1. The act commands the Interstate Commerce Commission that "all of the provisions of this act shall be administered and enforced with a view to carrying out the above declaration of policy." Congress, fearful, in the words of several members, that the Commission was "essentially a railroad minded body," took

every precaution to prevent discrimination against water carriers.⁸

Senators, particularly those from the Midwestern States where the barge lines involved here were operating, were especially fearful that the Commission would do substantially what it has done in this case. They required repeated assurance by the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate that the bill was written in such manner that the Commission could not if it desired permit discrimination against water carriers. At great length the chairman of that committee explained to apprehensive Senators that the bill contained provisions in three different places which imposed upon the Commission the imperative duty of standing in constant opposition to discrimination against shippers by water.⁹

House Members shared the same fears. The first conference report was defeated in the House because it was believed that the bill did not offer adequate protection for water carriers against hostile Interstate Commerce Commission action.¹⁰ A proponent of the bill told the House that "It is not fair to suggest, in my opinion, that the Commission and the courts will not look to this declaration of policy whenever they are called upon to make such construction of the statute and application of it. . . . The specific provisions of the bill carry out the declaration of policy.

Association, in the hearings before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House of Representatives, 74th Cong., 2d sess., on H. R. 5379: "This bill if enacted into law will place water carriers along the coast and upon our inland rivers under the absolute domination and control of the Interstate Commerce Commission. That Commission was created to regulate, conserve, and control railways. It is a railway-regulating agency. It naturally has the railway viewpoint, and past experience convinces us that the Commission, as now constituted, is railway-minded and that it would not be in the public interest to place water services under its domination and control. . . . We have observed the performance of the Commission in the past, under a comprehensive declaration of policy enacted by Congress, and that experience, we regret to say, has not inspired confidence." Hearings, p. 471.

"Mr. LUCAS. . . . Under the bill, as I understand it, the Interstate Commerce Commission would have the power, and it would be its duty, to fix rates on the Illinois River with respect to the transportation of that wheat and corn. Would it be possible for the Interstate Commerce Commission to fix the rate the same as the railroad rate from that point to St. Louis?"

"Mr. WHEELER. Not if the Commission does its duty, because the bill specifically provides that it must take into consideration the inherent advantages of the water carrier. Everyone agrees that goods can be shipped more cheaply by water than by rail." 84 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 5879.

The following Senators and Representatives, among others, either required assurance that the Commission would not discriminate against water carriers or expressed the conviction that under the statement of policy, the Commission would be unable to discriminate against water carriers: Senators Austin, Clark of Missouri, Connally, Ellender, Lucas, Miller, McNary, Norris, Pepper, Shipstead, Truman, and Wheeler; Representatives Blain, Bulwinkle, Crosser, Culkin, Halleck, Lea, Pierce of Oregon, Sparkman, and Wadsworth.

⁸ 84 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 6125-6128.

⁹ The first conference report was rejected by the House on May 9, 1940, 86 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 5886. The second report was accepted on August 12, 1940, 86 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 10193.

The courts and commissions will recognize that. . . .¹¹ Defending the policy provisions as a complete protection against Commission action antagonistic to barge transportation, another sponsor of the bill, opposing a safeguarding amendment, declared that to consider it necessary "You will have to further assume that the Interstate Commerce Commission will not enforce it. You will have to assume that if a case goes to the courts the courts will neither construe nor enforce the provisions of this policy."¹² As I see it, the Commission in this case has declined to enforce Congress' policy and the Court has failed to construe and enforce the act as Congress clearly intended it should.

This is not all. The first conference report having been defeated, the second conference report brought in changes intended to offer more protection to water carriers. The conferees reported that: "This measure will place upon the Interstate Commerce Commission not only the power, but the duty, to protect and foster water transportation and preserve its inherent advantages."¹³ As a closing, clinching argument intended to persuade the House that the Commission would be fair to water carriers, the statement of Commissioner Eastman (who dissented from the order of the Commission here) was quoted. Eastman assured the Congressmen interested in water transportation that certain provisions of the bill "coupled with the admonition in the declaration of policy in section 1 that the provisions of the act be so administered as to recognize and preserve the inherent advantages of each mode of transportation, will afford adequate protection in this respect. If experience should show that further protection is needed, contrary to our expectation, Congress can amend the act, but such a restriction as is now proposed is, we believe, both unnecessary and undesirable."¹⁴

The final statement of the last proponent of the 1940 act, spoken just before the vote was taken on the second conference report, were these: "There is nothing whatever in the pending measure which could by any fair interpretation be regarded as unjust to water transportation or to any other kind of transportation." The speaker then read the policy provisions of section 1 and asked: "How much plainer could language be than that is? It is crystal clear that there is no basis in the bill for the apprehension expressed by those opposed to the measure."¹⁵

Although these proceedings were not initiated under the 1940 act,¹⁶ the Commission

¹¹ 84 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 9685.

¹² 84 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 9863.

¹³ 86 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 10172.

¹⁴ 86 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 10191. In his dissenting opinion, Chairman Eastman said: "The report states that the 'proposed schedules will not prohibit the movement by barge-rail even to trunk line territory, their principal commercial effect being to reduce the profit of the Chicago elevator operators.' I do not so understand the evidence. . . . As I understand it, the effect of the proposed schedule, unless the prices paid to the farmers whose grain is barged are reduced, will be to limit the outlet of the ex-barge grain to local consumption in Chicago and to the lake and lake-rail routes to eastern points."

¹⁵ 86 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 10192.

¹⁶ The 1940 act gave the Commission jurisdiction to regulate water transportation directly. Here the same effect is achieved under the Commission's other powers by a tariff aimed at shippers who have previously used water transportation. For the background and nature of the 1940 act see Eastman, *The Transportation Problem* (30 Amer. Econ. Rev. 124); Stein, *Federal Regulation of Water Carriers* (16 Jour. Land and Pub. Util. Econ. 478); Harbeson, *The Transportation Act of 1940* (17 *ibid.*, 291); Regulation of Water Carriers (50 Yale L. Jour. 654).

¹⁷ 84 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 5965, 5983, 5980-81. Legislation similar in purpose to the 1940 act was considered by Congressional committees in the 74th and subsequent Congresses. Opposition to legislation giving the Commission authority over water transportation came from representatives of the water shippers. A typical protest was made by Cleveland A. Newton, general counsel, Mississippi Valley

should have felt itself bound by that congressional expression of policy. Yet the legislative history just recited makes it clear that the Commission has flagrantly flouted the express mandate of Congress. It is said, however, that the Commission reserves the right to take further action in a "proper proceeding" in which it "might prescribe proportional rates [on the ex-barge traffic] or joint barge-rail rates lower than the combinations." At some future day the Commission may correct this discrimination. But the day for Commission action was the day this case was decided, and the day for action by this Court is now. The Commission is not bound by the technical procedures of the common law, and it should not strain to avoid the enforcement of congressional will because of the formal fashion in which questions are presented to it. In this proceeding it was the Commission's duty "to protect and maintain a transportation system free from partiality to particular shippers. The Commission acted in its capacity as a public agency" and was obligated to carry out "duties imposed upon it by Congress in the interest of shippers generally, the national transportation system, and the public interest" (*United States v. Trucking Co.*, supra, 354). The fact that this was not a formal proceeding to fix proportional rates under section 6 (11) (b) did not detract from the Commission's powers (*Chicago R. I. & P. R. Co. v. United States*, 274 U. S. 28, 36; *United States v. New York Railroad Co.*, 272 U. S. 457, 462). The Commission itself in cases where the command of Congress was far less emphatic than here, has stated that an investigation and suspension proceeding such as this one "opens for consideration the lawfulness of the suspended rate under all provisions of the act" (*Sugar From Gulf Coast Port Groups to Northern Points*, 234 I. C. C. 247, 251). "The reproach of dealing with the matter piecemeal" is incurred by the Commission here as it was in *United States v. Chicago, M., St. P. & P. R. Co.* (294 U. S. 499, 510). It cannot, with due regard to its duty, shift responsibility "from the shoulders of the present to the shoulders of the days to come." Here, as in that case, postponement serves to leave "this particular carrier helpless in the interval."¹⁷

Congressman BLAND, who opposed the 1940 act on the ground that it lacked sufficient safeguards to prevent action by the Commission hostile to water transportation called attention to the procedural delays in rate cases before that body, delays which he declared would be used to strangle financially weak water carriers, forcing them to "yield or transfer their operation to other streams." He pointed out this "would mean the death of water carriers"; that the railroads knew how to obtain delay and knew the disastrous consequences that would follow to their competitors; that railroads "seek to profit" by procedural delay; and that the diversity of their interests and extent of their revenues was so great that they could survive delays which would be unendurable for competitors.¹⁸ The Congressman was a good observer and a sound prophet.

¹⁷ The court interprets the Commission's order as leaving open the right of the shippers affected to bring actions for reparations for injuries suffered under the new rates. This will bring small practical comfort to the barge lines since the shippers will be unlikely to ship by barge when the price of every shipment is dependent on future legal proceedings. The barge lines, "helpless in the interval" pending new legal proceedings, risk serious financial injury, if not bankruptcy. While the shippers can ship by barge now and sue later, they are presumably interested in buying transportation, not lawsuits.

¹⁸ 86 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 10181.

The judgment of the district court enjoining enforcement of this order was correct and should be affirmed.

Mr. Justice Douglas and Mr. Justice Murphy join in this opinion.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the minority views of the Interstate Commerce Committee upon the Transportation Act of 1939, presented to the Senate at that time by myself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the minority views (pt. 2 of report 433) were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINORITY VIEWS

(To accompany S. 2009, to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, by extending its application to additional types of carriers and transportation and modifying certain provisions thereof, and for other purposes)

A minority of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, to whom was referred the bill S. 2009, having considered the same, recommend that it do not pass.

IMPORTANT REASONS WHY S. 2009 SHOULD NOT PASS

1. Regulation of transportation in any form or by any tribunal operates to increase the cost of the service to the public. Regulation, therefore, should never be carried beyond a point positively necessary to curb improper practices and protect the public interest.

2. While the need for the regulation of the railroads has been proved, there is no showing of any need to regulate water carriers and other modes of transportation for the protection of the public interest or for the purpose of reducing the cost of transportation to the producers and the consumers of the Nation.

3. The producers and the consumers of the Nation pay the entire cost of transportation (including the tax payments that are made by each mode of transportation) regardless of what that total cost may be. Chairman WHEELER stated during the hearing:

"He (the farmer) pays the transportation cost on the thing he sells and he pays the transportation cost on the thing he buys."

Unquestionably, the burden of the freight cost falls most heavily upon the farmers, because, as Senator WHEELER points out, he pays the freight cost in both directions. Why then should the burden on the farmers be increased in the slightest degree? Why should the Congress hurriedly enact this legislation and risk increasing the farmers' burden at this time? Are not the farmers being dispossessed of their homes and their farms rapidly enough as a result of present economic inequality? The official records show they have been dispossessed by the hundreds of thousands. Since 1925 over one-third of the farms in the United States have changed hands through forced sale. Since when has the farmer received any interest return on his investment or for the sweat of his brow? Why should the consumers be called upon to bear any increase in the cost of transportation during these trying times when about one-half of our population is being called upon to feed the greatest relief roll in our history?

4. The witness, Hon. Joseph B. Eastman, member of the Interstate Commerce Commission and chairman of its legislative committee, testified that the bill will operate to stabilize the rates over water routes and prevent such rates from being so low as

to come under the prohibition against "destructive competition." In the sense of considering water rates versus railroad rates, "stabilization" means a freezing of the water rates and a discontinuance of the practice of making water rates each day so as to move commerce at low cost. Mr. Eastman testified in opposition to the bill on his own behalf and also on behalf of the Interstate Commerce Commission. All opponents of the bill, without exception, expressed a definite belief the bill will operate to increase the cost of transportation to the public.

5. The water highways of the Nation have been improved at public expense for the sole purpose of providing arteries of commerce over which transportation and distribution may be had at low cost. Regulation and the fixing of minimum rates, as the bill provides, will increase the cost of distribution materially, and that increased cost will be paid largely by the farmers.

6. Has demand for regulation of water carriers come from the farmers? Positively no. Has it come from the consumers? Positively no. Has it come from commercial organizations? Positively no. Has it come from the processors or distributors? Positively no. Where has the demand for regulation come from? It comes from the railroads. Railroad management wants to increase the railroad earnings for the benefit of the holders of their stocks and bonds. This is the sole purpose of this bill.

7. The bill is not designed to help railroad labor in any manner whatsoever. It cannot be interpreted nor applied so as to help railroad labor. Railroad labor—like all other labor—is sorely in need of a general increase in business activity in all directions to increase employment. This needed increase in business cannot be stimulated by raising the cost of transportation nor by the elimination of water carriers which should be used more extensively in an effort to expand industry and increase the volume of traffic for all modes of transportation. Examine the circumstances of the railroads that are in financial difficulty and it will be found that they are not losing tonnage to water routes. They are being crushed under the weight of their own structures. The tonnage now moving by water that might possibly be diverted to the railroads would not increase the employment of railroad labor. It would merely increase the distance between the engine and the caboose, and it would throw out of employment approximately 100,000 workers who are now engaged in the handling of this commerce. A diversion of traffic from the trucks to the railroads is not likely to increase rail-labor employment to any material extent. If all truckers are thrown out of their jobs it is certain to intensify the unemployment situation. Over 80 percent of the truck traffic is short-haul commerce that railroad management has proclaimed repeatedly as being undesirable and costly for railroad handling.

8. The coastal waterway improvements are nearing completion. The Great Lakes waterway improvements, including the New York State Barge Canal, are nearing completion. The Mississippi waterway improvements are nearing completion. They constitute the greatest inland system of improved navigable waters in the world. The improvement of the Mississippi waterway system is of such recent date that water-front facilities and watercraft necessary to economic and efficient handling of the enormous tonnage available to it is in its pioneering development stage. Regulation, as provided in this bill, is certain to stifle, retard, and possibly prevent the construction of this needed equipment. The requirement, under the restrictive provisions of this bill, to show a public necessity and convenience before engaging in water-carrier service will operate to the disadvantage of

the entire region tributary to this waterway system and particularly the Gulf ports that should be important distributing centers for much of this area.

9. The declaration of policy (sec. 1), the minimum rate authority (sec. 26), the rule of rate making (sec. 30), and the long-and-short-haul provision (sec. 50) must be read together to understand the true meaning of this bill and appreciate the important and disastrous increases in the Nation's freight cost that are likely to follow in its wake. Notwithstanding fervent representations by the proponents of the bill to the contrary—the four sections of the bill herein referred to are designed to hold the rate levels of the water carriers and the motor carriers to the railroad rate levels, or substantially so, and the need of the railroads for revenue to maintain their property and pay dividends. The bill was prepared and presented by railroad lawyers.

10. The bill attempts to codify (and, in a considerable degree, to rewrite) the whole body of Federal regulatory transportation law, which represents accumulated experience, necessary amendments, and court decisions of half a century. Its enactment will result in uncertainty and prolonged litigation to determine its meaning. Mr. Eastman urges that such extensive and important changes should be given long-time consideration. Codification is the duty of a public body which will consider such an enormous undertaking from the standpoint of the public interest. Aside from the origin of the bill, the undue haste and procedure adopted in furthering it are not only improper but tragically dangerous. Originally proposed by railroad management and railroad lawyers, this bill seeks to impose extreme and destructive regulations upon water carriers and motor carriers for the sole purpose of capturing for the railroads the business now moving over water and vehicular highways, and restore to the railroads a monopoly in the field of transportation. This will not be in the public interest.

BRIEF HISTORY OF REGULATORY LEGISLATION (Supporting No. 1)

Following an exhaustive study, and recognizing the demand of an injured and outraged public, the Congress of the United States passed, and the President signed, the Interstate Commerce Act on February 4, 1887, to become effective April 5 of the same year. It was aimed to correct and to eliminate certain practices and abuses of the railroads of that period, involving the granting of special and discriminatory rates and privileges, the giving of rebates to favored shippers, and the charging of higher rates at intermediate points than was being charged from more distant points over the same line and route on the same commodity. Regulation of other modes of transportation and particularly water transportation has been urged for a long period of time. Application of regulation to water carriers was urged for the purpose of lessening their influence in the reduction of railroad rates and not because of any other wrongdoing against the public interest. The Interstate Commerce Commission, in its first annual report in 1888, made the following recommendation:

"The Commission also recommends that the carriers engaged independently in interstate traffic on the rivers, lakes, and other navigable waters of the country be put in respect to the making, publishing, and maintaining rates upon the same footing with interstate carriers by rail. It is believed they will be benefited rather than harmed thereby, and that the excuses now made by carriers by rail for great disparities in rates for corresponding transportations as between points which are and points which are not affected by water competition would thereby to a large extent be taken away."

No one can read the above recommendation and be left with the impression that regulation is wanted or needed for any other purpose than to raise the water cost of transportation high enough to eliminate any need for the railroads to reduce their rates.

The above report was made to the Fifth Congress, and for over 50 years each Congress has refused to place the water carriers under regulation of any agency of the Government. During all this time there has been no showing of any need for regulation of water carriers to protect the public interest, and there is no such showing at the present time. Many of the railroads are in bad financial condition while others are in excellent financial condition. The roads that are in bad shape, for the most part, cannot and have not pointed to water competition as the basis for their trouble. The condition of the roads that are in bad shape has been seized upon by the Association of American Railroads as a possible means of destroying all competitive modes of transportation and restoring the monopoly they held for so many years. The Interstate Commerce Commission, unwittingly or otherwise, has lent its influence to the idea of regulation, until all modes of transportation are now under regulation except the carriers by water.

The economy of transportation by water must be preserved, and the carriers by water should not be placed under regulation until it can be shown they are indulging in monopolistic practices and failing to give to the public the low water rates the producers and the consumers are entitled to enjoy over these publicly maintained highways.

Regulation of the railroads, in its present form, has been made necessary by reason of their own improper acts. They were not put under regulation for the purpose of protecting some other mode of transportation. That the present regulation of the railroads is not rigid enough is abundantly demonstrated by their acts and practices currently from year to year. (See S. Rept. No. 25 (in six parts, 76th Cong., 1st sess., pursuant to S. Res. 71, 74th Cong.)) The provisions of the original Interstate Commerce Act did not reach and correct all of the railroad practices that were regarded as improper and against the public interest, and, therefore, the act has been amended from time to time until it is now claimed by railroad managements that the railroads of the Nation are being strangled by a system of strait-jacket regulation. The minority find no basis for subscribing to that viewpoint. Furthermore, it is significant that railroad managements are not seeking the repeal of any provision of the act which might operate to reduce the cost of transportation to the public.

It is important to observe here that during the 50-year period of building up regulation of the railroads to correct their abuses the Congress has not only refused to put the water carriers under regulation but it has responded to public demand for the improvement of the Nation's waterways and has appropriated public funds to provide arteries of commerce over which transportation and distribution may be had at low cost. We must not now be blinded by the financial condition of some of the railroads and the smoke screen that is hiding the purpose to regulate the water carriers of the Nation. The purpose of this legislation is to prevent one type of carrier from rendering transportation service at low cost when by so doing it will depress the rates of another carrier or operate to divert the business from the high-cost carrier. The public is entitled to water-carrier service at low cost, and regulation cannot do otherwise than stabilize and increase the cost of the service.

Motor-carrier regulation was enacted in 1935 without public demand for such regulation. It has not operated to reduce the cost of motor-carrier transportation. The witness representing the motortruck operators reports general satisfaction with regulation by

the Interstate Commerce Commission. They should be satisfied with their regulation, those who have remained in the business, because their rates have been rapidly stabilized and thousands of the small independent truckers who were able to make a living before regulation are now out of business. Many of the independent truck operators who have thus far survived have been denied the privilege of maintaining service at rates profitable to them but lower than existing charges. Would there have come an expression of satisfaction from the larger truck operators except for the fact that they are collecting increased charges and are being relieved rapidly of the competition of independent operators? It is significant that no such position was taken by the motortruck operators. The witness, Mr. Eastman, stated the Commission has invoked the minimum-rate rule extensively against truck operators to prevent the establishment of rates and charges that were regarded as being too low.

The improper practices of the railroads that made necessary the present regulation of them does not appear to have been adopted by the other modes of transportation. There is positively no evidence, nor is there the slightest suggestion, that water carriers have indulged in or are indulging in the practice of charging rates that are excessive, that are discriminatory, that are preferential, or that are prejudicial.

While the motortruck carriers, under regulation, have been able to stabilize most of their rates and charges on the basis of the railroad-rate levels, or closely to that level, there is no showing of improper or unfair dealing with the public as regards discrimination, preference, or prejudice. Their use of the public vehicular highways in the future may, therefore, be predicated upon their convenience and necessity more largely than upon their economy and savings in transportation costs to the public.

The bill carries no provision that assures the preservation or the protection of short-line railroads, many of which will be ruthlessly destroyed if and when their joint rates and services with other railroads are terminated.

WATER AND MOTOR CARRIERS (Supporting No. 2)

The expansion of water-carrier and motor-carrier service is of recent development and largely within the past 15 years. This development has gone far toward breaking railroad monopoly in the field of transportation. It came about following the unusual increases in railroad rates of 1920. These railroad-rate increases, following former heavy increases, left little or nothing of the consumer's dollar for the farmer engaged in the production of the essentials of life. These high rates were forcing industry to decentralize and shorten the transportation haul in every direction, or relocate at points having deep-water navigation and low-water rates. The shift of population following the shift of industry had its effect upon congressional representation and it awakened the Nation to the economic danger of such a trend. Agriculture needed and sought relief from these high freight costs. Farms could not be moved and industrial workers were necessarily concentrating along the rim of the Nation and farther from the source of farm production. The answer to this growing economic problem was found when agriculture and industry joined hands for the improvement of all navigable waters for transportation purposes, together with an extensive program for improved vehicular highways.

The water highways and the vehicular highways belong to all the people and should be used forever in the public interest. The improvement work is nearing completion and whatever benefit can be obtained from lowest transportation over these highways should be conserved in the public interest.

Regulation of water and motor carriers cannot and will not lower the cost of transportation for these means of distribution. There has been no showing that water or motor carriers need to be regulated for any purpose except to lessen the effect of their competition upon the railroads. The adoption of this legislation clearly contemplates a freezing of the water-carriers' rate structure to a higher level approximating the railroad rates.

THE PRODUCERS AND THE CONSUMERS TO BEAR
THE INCREASED BURDEN
(Supporting No. 3)

That there will be an increase, and likely a substantial increase, in the Nation's transportation bill by the adoption of this legislation, there can be no reasonable doubt. It seems incredible that any person can take refuge in the thought that the Interstate Commerce Commission, which has been urging regulation of water carriers since its first annual report in 1888 to curb their effect on the railroads, will not be immediately sympathetic to an increase in water rates. And, if they were not sympathetic to an increase, they would have no escape from the demand imposed upon them under the provisions of the bill when they are confronted with a formal proceeding in which demand is made for an increase in the water-transportation rates.

There can be no concealment of the fact that the producers and the consumers of the Nation actually pay the entire cost of transportation, regardless of what that total cost may be. Nor should it be overlooked that included in that cost are the tax payments that are made by each mode of transportation. The carriers in every case are simply tax collectors and not taxpayers in the true sense.

Unquestionably, the burden of the freight cost falls most heavily upon the farmer, because, as Senator WHEELER points out, he pays the freight in both directions. Why then should the burden of the farmers be increased in the slightest degree? Why should the Congress hurriedly enact this legislation and invite an increase in the farmers' burden at this time? Are not the farmers being dispossessed of their homes and their farms rapidly enough under our present economy, which has stabilized disparity and inequality? The official records show they are being dispossessed by the hundreds of thousands. Since when has the farmer received any interest return on his investment or for the sweat of his brow? The consumers should not be called upon to bear increased transportation costs during these trying times while they and the producers are being asked to carry the greatest number of unemployed on relief.

Farm income has declined 40 percent in the years from 1920 to 1938. The ratio of prices paid to prices received by farmers has dropped from 105 in 1920 to 78 in 1938. The decline in income and in ratio is a staggering and destructive blow that will take a long while to correct and overcome. Nothing has so far been accomplished through farm-relief measures to permanently improve this situation. Despite the fact that we paid out 34 percent more in farm subsidies in 1938 than we did in 1937, farm income was 11 percent lower in 1938 than it was in 1937. Legislation of this kind can only make this vicious attack on the farm standard of living worse. During this time the total units of farm production have shown an increase.

The income for the more prosperous railroads in 1938 was sufficient to equal an aggregate return on the stocks and bonds of all the railroads of the Nation approximating 2 percent. No other important economic group fared better. Certainly the farm income and consumer income is in no condition to sustain the slightest increase in the cost of distribution. The average revenue per ton-mile of the railroads was, in 1920, 1,052 as

compared with 0.982 in 1938, a decrease of 6½ percent. The revenue ton-miles for the same years decreased 29 percent, while railroad employment decreased 53½ percent. The physical condition of the railroads at the end of 1938 is reported as normal or better; all roads being included and taken as a whole. The income to railroad investors, on the whole, is not satisfactory but it has been uniformly better than most of the industrial groups and far better than farm income (which has been below zero for a long while). There is no economic sense to voting aid and assistance to the farmers in one bill while in another bill (this bill) the Congress permits the taking of a greater sum from him by means of increasing his freight costs.

Nowhere, apparently, has reasonable or proper consideration been given to the interests of the producers and the consumers of the Nation in the preparation of this bill. Regulation is certain to increase the cost of transportation to everyone even though residing inland from water ports. The price paid the farmer for grain is based upon the cost of water transportation over a considerable part of the distance on its journey to the consumer. Regulation, admittedly, will be helpful to some of the carriers, but it will be costly to the public and improperly so.

INCREASE THE FREIGHT COST
(Supporting No. 4)

For years the Interstate Commerce Commission has recommended regulation for water carriers for the purpose of harmonizing the cost of transportation over both water and rail routes. Mr. Eastman expresses the opinion this legislation will operate to stabilize water rates. Opponents of this bill have expressed a definite belief it will operate to increase the cost of transportation if it becomes law. Under the provisions of existing laws the railroads are entitled to earn 5½ percent on the money invested in railroad plant. The railroad managements represent this investment to be in excess of \$26,000,000,000. On the railroad basis of investment the annual net income should be \$1,495,000,000. Their net income has been about one-third that amount and has been held down by competition of other modes of transportation, largely water-carrier competition. The manner in which it is proposed to regulate water carriers means increasing the water-carrier rates more nearly to the rail rates. While there are some provisions of the pending bill that provide for the fixing of rates according to the character and type of service, such provisions are definitely qualified by language that commands the protection of the railroad revenues. Water-carrier regulation is not demanded by the public; it is not wanted by the public, it cannot reduce the transportation cost to the public, and it has absolutely no purpose except to stabilize the water rates upward.

WATER AND VEHICULAR HIGHWAYS—WHO BENEFITS FROM LOW-COST TRANSPORTATION
(Supporting No. 5)

The Great Lakes Waterway system is among the first of our inland water routes to be improved for heavy freight traffic. The dredging and improving of the Lakes chain, the building of water-front facilities, and water craft are all a part of this important water highway and for the most part the improvements have been prosecuted at public expense. This system now connects with ocean commerce at Montreal over the St. Lawrence River and at New York over the New York State Barge Canal.

Great ocean ports have been developed at the principal cities along the east and west coasts and along the Gulf. Over these improved waters is handled the import and the export business of the Nation and all foreign shipping with a few unimportant ex-

ceptions. These ocean ports are being connected with a system of coastal canals stretching along the Gulf and the Atlantic to form almost a continuous inland route from Corpus Christi, Tex., to New York. This inland route provides protection to shipping from the hazards of ocean navigation.

The Mississippi Waterway system constitutes the most recent undertaking of the Federal Government to bring deep-water navigation into the heart of the Nation's productive area from the soil and the mine. From the Gulf at New Orleans it stretches northward to Minneapolis, Minn., and like fingers of the hand it serves Pittsburgh, over the Ohio; Kansas City, Omaha, and Sioux City, over the Missouri; Chicago and the Great Lakes over the Illinois, and numerous other points of importance over improved tributaries. Upon this system rests the hope, and the only hope, of agriculture and a great inland empire for a reduction in the freight cost of distribution. The purpose that inspired the improvement of this great waterway must not be defeated by the regulation of water carriers and the fixing of minimum rates. Water-front facilities and watercraft are just coming into service on this improved highway. Commerce over it is on the increase and the benefits of low-cost transportation are accruing to the farmers of the region and farm products are on the move that otherwise would have no value to the farmer. It is impractical, in this brief appeal for defeat of this legislation, to enumerate any considerable number of specific instances where farmers and consumers receive benefit from the low-cost transportation now being made available. It is hoped the following citations will be convincing and sufficient evidence to overwhelmingly defeat this bill:

Gen. T. Q. Ashburn, president, Inland Waterways Corporation, testified as to important movement of grain by water and on which the farmers actually did receive materially higher prices because of the low water costs of transportation. General Ashburn filed for the record a letter dated Dalton, Mo., December 7, 1938, from the Farmers Elevator Co. It reads:

"Because of the loading facilities the Glasgow Elevator Co. has on the river, they are able to pay 6 cents a bushel more for corn and wheat than we can and this grain that belongs to our trade territory is going to Glasgow.

"We are about 4½ miles from the river where we think might be a good place for us to load on barges. Would we be allowed to build a loading dock on the river? Could we load as many as 5,000 bushels on these barges or would we have to have more grain than that at one time?

"Unless the railroad lowers their freight rates or we can load on the river, it looks as though we will be put out of business. Any information along this line will be very much appreciated."

This elevator company, while feeling it is likely to be put out of business, is not asking that the low water rates be denied the farmers of that locality.

Quoting in part from a telegram from McKee Feed & Grain Co., Muscatine, Iowa:

"We have an elevator located on the Mississippi River at this city and last year moved more than 2,000,000 bushels of corn via Mississippi River to New Orleans for export. We attracted corn from points as far west as 150 miles due to our ability to pay a good price on account of cheap transportation on the river."

Please take serious note of the fact that the farmers received a higher price for the corn that went into the world market than was currently being paid elsewhere. Also from the record is a telegram to Chairman WHEELER from Hart, Bartlett, Sturtevant

Grain Co., Kansas City, Mo., dated April 7, 1939. It reads:

"Permit us to call attention to the fact that our organization moves large quantity grain by river, particularly for export. We handle this grain on very narrow margin of profit. We are enabled to pay higher prices for such grain because river transportation is available. Furthermore, under ordinary circumstances when United States grain is near a competitive basis in foreign importing markets the fact that grain can be moved from interior of the United States by water often makes export business in grain from this country which could not be exported without the benefit of water rates. This certainly has a bearing on the price which our farmers receive for their grain, and we believe that your committee should give these facts due consideration."

The record contains a communication from Mr. H. D. Rolf, president, the Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, Montana Division, reading in part as follows:

"Attention is directed to the fact that the farmers' union, Montana division, has consistently urged the development of navigable waters for transportation purposes. We are a long way from the consumers' market, and the cost of distribution of our products absorbs the larger portion of our consumer dollars. The only way we farmers of Montana can realize a greater share of the consumer dollar is to reduce the cost of distribution."

"The only way we see of materially reducing the cost of distribution is through a utilization of water transportation over as great a portion of the distance as is reasonably possible. We have advocated the development of the 9-foot channel in the upper Mississippi, and we have been very aggressive in our demand for this development."

The North Dakota division of the Farmers Union, the Farmers Elevator Association of South Dakota, the Farm Bureau Federation of Minnesota and South Dakota have joined in the demand for the improvement of the upper Mississippi River for transportation purposes and to reduce the cost of distribution. Supporting communications from these and numerous other cooperative farm-marketing organizations constitute a part of the record in this proceeding. The Midland Cooperative, having a membership of approximately 100,000 farmers and consumers, supports the need of water transportation at low cost and is on record against regulation of water carriers because they feel that regulation is certain to increase the cost of water service.

The witness, McClure, testified as to his knowledge of a substantial reduction in rate on cotton over the water route. The witness, Childs, expressed positive knowledge that sugar costs are now figured on the basis of water-cost transportation; that railroad rates on sugar from Colorado to Chicago have been reduced to equalize the water rate from New Orleans. The witness, Feltus, expressed positive knowledge that in the distribution of grain and grain products, all savings in the cost of water transportation goes to the producer or the consumer and that such savings are not absorbed by the millers or other intermediate agencies of distribution. He also expressed positive knowledge that coal consumers of the Northwest are given the benefit of the low cost of water transportation. The record contains many important and interesting illustrations from which we submit the following:

The all-rail mileage from Duluth to Buffalo is almost exactly 1,000 miles, and it is almost the same by the water route. The difference is about 12 miles. The normal rate for transporting grain by boat from Duluth to Buffalo is around a cent and a half to 2 cents per bushel for 1,000 miles, which represents an actual cost of less than one-half mill per ton per mile.

"From Duluth to Buffalo, where the rate is depressed because of this water competition, it is still 18½ cents per bushel. In other words, it is 17 cents per bushel more to transport grain by railroad, under this depressed rate from Duluth to Buffalo, than it is to move it by water from Duluth to Buffalo."

"Now the cost for hauling grain 1,000 miles from eastern Montana to Duluth is 25 cents per bushel."

Some of the proponents of this bill have expressed doubt that the producers and the consumers get the benefit of the low cost of water transportation. The record is conclusive against this viewpoint. Even though there might be merit in a contention of that kind, it would constitute no sound basis for regulation to increase the water cost of transportation. The Congress has the power to inquire into the uses being made of our inland navigable waters and vehicular highways. If the public is not receiving the benefit of low-cost transportation to the extent it should, there are proper means to compel adequate consideration of the public interest.

What has been said of the economies of water-carrier transportation applies with equal force to motor-carrier transportation except, of course, the economies of motor-carrier service are much less in amount and frequently the only preference in the use of motor-carrier service as against railroad service is convenience. That motor-carrier transportation over the Nation's highways has increased the economy and efficiency of distribution is amply supported by the record. Regulation of motor carriers covers only a short period of time and there is much doubt if it has brought any benefit to the public.

The shrinking of the income of the producers and the consumers of the Nation by means of increased cost of transportation that is bound to result from the enactment of this bill is a factor the supporters of this legislation seem determined to ignore.

NO PUBLIC DEMAND FOR WATER-CARRIER REGULATION

(Supporting No. 6)

There is no public demand for the regulation of water carriers or motor carriers. No demand comes from the farmers; no demand comes from the consumers; no demand comes from commercial organizations; no demand comes from processors or distributors. A committee of six, composed of railroad management and railroad labor points to regulation as a means of aiding the railroads in building up their revenues and traffic. This committee, however, claims the greatest need of the railroads is a general increase in business activity on a wide scale. The President, in his appeal for legislation to aid the railroads, has not requested regulation that is designed to increase the cost of water-carrier transportation and eventually destroy the economy and efficiency of water- and motor-carrier service. Railroad management and railroad lawyers drafted this legislation to codify the act to regulate commerce and it is most difficult to locate all dangerous provisions of the bill. It is generally conceded, however, that the bill is designed to improve the income of the holders of railroad stocks and bonds.

RAILROAD LABOR

(Supporting No. 7)

Railroad labor—like all other labor—is sorely in need of a general increase in business activity in all directions. The revenue and labor situation as to one railroad may be excellent, but that will not benefit the revenue and labor situation as to other railroads. Many of our railroads have been comparatively prosperous during the lean years of the depression. Others have gone from bad to worse, without regard to their freedom of water competition. The national

railroad situation cannot be solved en masse. The basic cause of the sick railroads must be determined individually and dealt with accordingly. It is impossible to make 100 suits of clothes fit 100 men that are tall, short, thin, and fat by cutting all suits to the average measurement of the 100 men. The same principle applies to transportation and many other economic questions. The railroads reduced the number of workers from 2,022,832 in 1920 to 940,000 in 1933—a reduction of 53½ percent—while the ton-miles of revenue freight decreased only 29 percent. The cost of moving 1,000 ton-miles of revenue freight was reduced from \$10.78 in 1921 to \$6.41 in 1937. These figures demonstrate that railroad labor is contributing generously to the economy of rail transportation. Putting it another way, it is important to observe that the Railroad Brotherhood members move a greater number of pounds of revenue freight a greater distance per hour of service than the employees of water or motor carriers. Calculate the number of motor-carrier employees it requires to move 3,000 tons of freight 150 miles that can be moved that distance by railroad in 8 hours with a train crew of 5 men. The manpower required to move freight by water is greater than the manpower required to move the same volume by railroad over the same distance.

This committee has received noncontroverted evidence showing that railroad employment would not be improved if all water commerce that might be diverted to the railroads is so diverted. This evidence shows the additional tonnage taken from the water carriers can be handled on regularly scheduled trains by increasing the distance between the engine and the caboose. The presently unused tractive power of service locomotives might employ a few extra grunts, but that is about all. Considering this diversion of tonnage from water carriers to rail carriers from the standpoint of employment, it would throw out of work approximately 100,000 workers now engaged in this service without helping railroad employment in the slightest degree.

As to the diversion of motor-carrier tonnage to the railroads, it should be remembered that more than 80 percent of this tonnage is short-haul traffic that railroad management has represented they cannot handle profitably and were not handling profitably before the advent of motor-carrier service.

This bill is not designed to help railroad labor in any manner whatsoever. It is solely for the purpose of increasing the net income and improving the railroad financial structure and freezing it at its present level or higher. Such a program cannot revive industrial activity that is so badly needed.

IMPROVED WATER HIGHWAYS

(Supporting No. 8)

All of our coastal and inland waters have required extensive and costly improvement work to make them suitable for present-day navigation. This improvement work has, for the most part, been prosecuted with Federal funds under the direction of the Secretary of War and the United States Army engineers. The most costly of these improvement works per mile of navigable water is the coastal harbors and channels. Closely approaching this cost is the improvement of the Great Lakes system. Then follows the Intracoastal Canal system and the Mississippi River system. The Mississippi River system, per mile of navigable water made available by improvement work, is the most economical development of the entire navigable waterway program. This system is so situated as to serve the greatest area of production within our border. It cuts through the center of our productive area from North to South for a distance of 2,000 miles. It cuts through the center of this region from East to West

for more than 2,000 miles. It has 2,000 additional miles of improved tributaries.

Water ports are now within an average distance of 155 miles of all inland shipping points. Exclusive of maintenance and operation, the cost to the Federal Government in the development of this entire system of improved navigable waters is less than \$2,000,000,000. Maintenance and operation has been approximately \$700,000,000. The provisions of bill S. 2009 are designed to curtail the use of this great waterway by leveling the water-carrier rates to the basis of the railroad rates or substantially so. The idea is to force the tonnage back to the rail carriers.

The Congress, for over 50 years, has withstood rail-carrier demands for water-carrier regulation and throughout that time it has ignored the recommendation of the Interstate Commerce Commission to put water carriers under regulation. There are sound reasons for keeping the water carriers free from regulation.

POLICY SECTION—MINIMUM RATE—RATE-MAKING RULE

(Supporting No. 9)

Section 1, declaration of policy; section 26, minimum-rate authority; section 30, rule of rate making; and section 50, long-and-short-haul rule, are inseparable in the application and interpretation of this bill. While the preamble of section 1 provides that regulation of all modes of transportation shall be so administered as to recognize and preserve the inherent advantages of each, the section also definitely qualifies that language by declaring for sound economic conditions among the several carriers; the maintenance of reasonable charges without discrimination or unfair competitive practices; and most important of all is the mandate to construe the section to the end of insuring the preservation of a national system of transportation adequate at all times to meet the full needs of the commerce, the Postal Service, and the national defense. The rule of rate making gives some support to the preamble of section 1, but both are related and controlled by the specific provision of section 26 which gives to the Interstate Commerce Commission power to fix a minimum rate applicable to a contract carrier. The minimum charge so prescribed by the Commission shall give no advantage or preference to such contract carrier in competition with a common carrier. The Commission is further directed to give due consideration to the effect of such minimum charge upon the movement of traffic by such carriers.

A careful reading of the bill and particularly the aforementioned provisions will disclose that these provisions, despite the generality of some of the clauses inserted therein, could reasonably be interpreted to mean that in the determination of rates and charges applicable to waterway carriers, due consideration must be given to the effect of such rates and charges on the movement of traffic by railroads, to the need of adequate and efficient railroad service, and to the need of railroad revenues sufficient to enable the railroads to provide such service to the public. This view may find support in the significant proviso of section 23 (8) which makes it mandatory for the Commission to assign the fixing of rates for all modes of transportation to the same group of administrators within the Commission. Any doubt as to the meaning of these provisions as applied to this bill would eventually have to be resolved by the United States Supreme Court. Meanwhile, the attendant litigation through the Commission and the courts would result in several years of chaos, which would tend to destroy the ability of the water carriers to perform an adequate and economical service to the public. Should the Supreme Court hold, as under the bill it clearly appears it must, that consideration be given to the need of the railroads for

revenues sufficient to enable them to maintain a more expensive service, then the ability of water carriers to perform an adequate and efficient service at the lowest cost consistent with the furnishing of such service would be totally destroyed.

CODIFICATION

(Supporting No. 10)

This attempt, originated by a group of railroad lawyers, to codify, revise, and rewrite the whole body of Federal regulatory law should be summarily rejected by the Senate. Witness after witness, who qualified as authorities on transportation law, protested their inability to understand, in the brief time given to compare and study this bill with existing law, the full import of its many provisions. Not only was this made most difficult by the changes in wording, phraseology, and definition in the provisions taken from numerous statutes, but the manner in which they had been shuffled and the many new provisions which have been included in the bill added to the confusion.

The chairman of the legislative committee of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Mr. Eastman, strongly opposed this method of codification as not in the public interest. Mr. Eastman testified at length on this subject. His remarks, condensed with care to preserve their context, are as follows:

"Senate 2009, instead of adding a new part or parts to the Interstate Commerce Act providing for the proposed regulation of water and air carriers and the special investigations, undertakes to combine the present part I, which deals with railroads and affiliated companies, with the present part II, which deals with motor carriers, and interlards therewith the new provisions with respect to the regulation of water and air carriers and the special investigations. The result is a virtual codification of the entire Interstate Commerce Act, and in the process many provisions have been changed materially and in ways that were not proposed, specifically, at least, in the report of the committee of six, and which have not been recommended in any other report which has been made public. . . . It seems to me that every major objective of the bill can be accomplished, and readily, without such codification. . . . If there were need for such a codification, a public body should do the work and make a report of what it has done before the matter comes up for consideration. . . ."

"The CHAIRMAN. It is really the function of Congress to declare the public policy, rather than that of the Commission.

"Certainly. I did not intend to say anything to the contrary to that. If you have in mind the public body, that would not necessarily be the Commission. I mean a public body as distinguished from a committee of railroad executives, railroad employees, a body that looks at this matter from the standpoint of the public interest and then makes a report in which it shows just what has been done, what is proposed to do, and what the reasons. . . . If you are going to undertake such an important job as the codification of the Interstate Commerce Act, I think, as a matter of procedure, the initial work should be done by a body representing the whole public and that that body should make a report which will disclose what it has done and the reason for it, so that those who are directly interested and concerned can have full notice of what is proposed, instead of being asked in the middle of a session to consider, without any such report, a bill of 183 pages, or two-hundred-odd pages, such as the bill before the House, and be asked to look through and find out, at their peril, in what way it may affect them. I do not believe that is proper procedure.

"The present part I has for its nucleus the original act to regulate commerce of 1887, but includes the many and extensive amendments which have been made since that time.

From the standpoint of form, arrangement, and phraseology it is, because of the way in which it was evolved, an imperfect product; but it has been the subject of much litigation, many of its provisions have been interpreted by the Supreme Court, and its administration is not now attended by any serious legal difficulties arising out of imperfections in form or phraseology.

"While the railroads, motor carriers, and water carriers are all engaged in transportation, they function, operate, and do business in general in very different ways, and any sound system of regulation must recognize, and be adjusted to those differences. When the Motor Carrier Act, 1935—part II of the Interstate Commerce Act—was proposed, the plan of interlarding the new regulation with the old regulation of part I was considered and rejected. The danger of tampering with the provisions of part I, which had undergone so much litigation and court interpretations, was realized, and it also seemed desirable that the motor carriers should have a statute of their own which would define their duties and responsibilities and the jurisdiction of the Commission over them. It required a little more paper and ink, but otherwise produced clearer-cut results and simplified the situation for the thousands of motor carriers."

As to the adoption of a codifying act, the minority subscribes to the views above expressed by Mr. Eastman. It must be clear that if Congress adopts this revision and codification, in such large part prepared by attorneys for the railroads, and enacts it into law, superseding existing statutes, that much greater changes will be wrought in the law and much greater injury will be done than Congress can now realize.

CONCLUSION

Regulatory legislation in the past has been designed to correct and eliminate certain abuses and improper practices of the railroads as they adversely affected the public interest, and to prevent the imposition of discriminatory and excessive rates and charges that were the outgrowth of a monopolized system of transportation. In short, such legislation has been designed to protect the public. S. 2009 has no such purpose. It is a new departure in legislation in that, under the specious pleas of "equality of regulation," it seeks to force water carriers and other modes of transportation to increase rates to the level of rail rates or substantially to that level and maintain them there. The ultimate result would, of course, force the competitors of the railroads out of business, thus depriving the public of low-cost transportation.

Public demand for regulation, as proposed in this bill, is definitely lacking. While the proponents of the bill insist its enactment will be helpful to the railroads, they have made no attempt to show that it will serve or help the public who will be called upon to pay higher rates and charges for transportation service. The opponents of this legislation are in accord on the proposition that this bill will operate to increase the cost of transportation, but the proponents insist the increase in the water rates will not necessarily bring them up to the level of the rail rates. The regulation of water carriers under this bill can have no other purpose than to force water rates up to a point where the water carriers cannot successfully move commerce at a saving to the public. The same is true as applied to motorbus transportation which now supplies low-cost passenger service to the public. The whole purpose of the bill is to protect the holders of railroad securities.

The minority of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, for the reasons herein set forth and abundantly supported by the record, recommends that the bill S. 2009 do not pass.

HENRIK SHIPSTEAD.

RECESS

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I do not wish to yield the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not wish the floor.

Mr. REED. I yield briefly.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess for 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senate will stand in recess for 2 minutes.

At the expiration of the recess (at 2 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate reassembled, when it was called to order by the Vice President.

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of Mr. RUSSELL's motion that the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 98 and 99 to the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, in the next 20 minutes I wish to talk about farm-crop insurance. In my service in the Senate I doubt if there has been a single matter which has come before the Senate about which there has been so little information and so much misinformation as obtained with respect to the important question of crop insurance. I hope to be able to clear away some of the mystery or fog surrounding this question.

The Farm Crop Insurance Corporation is a statutory body, created by authority of the Congress, and not established by Executive authority.

Let me begin by reading from page 6881 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday. I read with some astonishment the view which the House Committee on Appropriations took on this question. Let me read from the remarks of Representative DIRKSEN, of Illinois, who is one of the conferees on the part of the House:

I might say that the only items in disagreement now are those relating to so-called crop insurance that will be reported in disagreement directly, and I hope to say a word or two more about it. It has been represented to the House and it is a fact that the House conferees had unanimously and consistently opposed on every occasion the continuation of the so-called Crop Insurance Corporation.

Down to that point, Mr. President, there can be no criticism. That is the privilege of every Member of the House.

Speaking of the action of the House Appropriations Committee, of which he is a member, Mr. DIRKSEN continued:

We have provided for its liquidation. It ought to be liquidated, and if necessary we should go on record once more in an overwhelming way as an admonition to the Senate as to how we feel about the continuation of that insurance program.

Mr. President, I had the idea that when it was found desirable to discontinue a body set up by authority of the Congress such action should be taken through the legislative committees; and yet here is action taken by the House Appropriations Committee which has the effect, to use

the language of the very brilliant Representative from Illinois, of liquidating, by action of the Appropriations Committee, a body which has been set up by legislative authority. That is my objection No. 1. I appeal to the Senate, out of respect for its own dignity, to object to and dissent from that kind of action.

Mr. President, I wish to proceed to the next point. In this connection I should like to appeal to those who have not, perhaps, followed this matter as closely as some of the others of us have. I wish to separate immediately the crop-insurance program from the N. Y. A., the A. A. A., and F. S. A., and all the other so-called agricultural agencies. All of them, with the exception of this agency, more or less partake of a subsidy, charity, alms, or help of some kind.

Here is a program which has but one purpose, namely, to help remove the ever-present fear of the farmer of a crop failure and its results upon him, his family, and his income. There is no charity about this program. There is no subsidy about it in its long-range intention. It is true that immediately the Government of the United States is sponsoring and financing it. There is no other agency in the United States great enough and willing to do so. But the hope is that within 3 more years we shall be able at least to determine whether or not it is feasible to work out a crop-insurance program, first, for wheat; secondly, for cotton, and then for any other crop which may be considered. It is hoped that by then we shall be able to determine whether we can work out a program which will carry itself, and if it can, the Government will not be expected to participate.

I can appreciate the fact that in the controversy with respect to the production of wheat some of my good friends from States in New England, from New Jersey particularly, and from West Virginia, look at us differently from the way we look at ourselves. We are farmers from farm States. We produce food, of course, and we are interested in receiving the best price for it we can obtain. Conversely, Senators who come from States along the Atlantic coast, and West Virginia, principally, are concerned about obtaining their food as cheaply as possible, and so then have indulged us during the past 10 years quite considerably with our so-called farm program. However, I wish to say to my colleagues from those States that this program is separate and distinct, that it does not partake of subsidy or of charity. We do not ask for either. We do not want it, and we do not expect it.

Mr. President, I have found greater misunderstanding among Members of the Senate, and of the other House, if you please, concerning this program, than about anything else I have discussed with them. Yesterday I went over to the House and discussed this very program with Members of the House. I found them in almost total ignorance of the extent to which the farmers have participated in the program.

Allow me to give the figures, first with respect to wheat. The law providing for

wheat crop insurance was enacted in 1938. The program became effective in 1939. In 1939, 165,000 farmers took out wheat crop insurance. In 1943, 360,000 farmers took out wheat crop insurance. In 1941, 371,000 farmers took out wheat crop insurance. In 1941, 412,000 farmers took out wheat crop insurance.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I do not wish in any way to hinder the speech the Senator is making, but does he have the figures on that huge number represented by State lines?

Mr. REED. I have, and I shall get to them in a moment.

Mr. McNARY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. REED. This year, 1943, there are 487,000 farmers holding wheat crop insurance.

I have broken down this information by States. When I say I have broken it down, I mean that I have obtained the information from official sources. I shall read the list of States which have principally participated because of the nature of their farming. When I reach the bottom of the list, if any Senator should desire to know what his State is doing, I shall be very happy to tell him, and I hope the senior and junior Senators from Nebraska are present.

The farmers of Nebraska have 67,000 contracts. Nebraska tops the list. The farmers of Kansas come next with 42,000. The farmers of Ohio come third, with 40,000 contracts. The farmers of Michigan come fourth, with 32,000 contracts. In Indiana the farmers have 32,000 contracts. In Missouri they have 30,000. In Illinois they have 29,000. In Oklahoma they have 22,000. In Minnesota they have 20,000. In North Dakota they have 13,000. In South Dakota they have 9,000. In Texas they have 9,000. I have given only the round numbers, in thousands.

In order to show that this program is not sectional in its scope, I will say that among the Eastern States, Pennsylvania raises more wheat than any other State. In Pennsylvania there are 7,086 of these contracts. In Maryland there are 2,448. In Colorado there are 4,138.

If the Senator from Oregon is interested in the number of wheat crop insurance contracts in his State, I shall be very happy to put the number into the RECORD at this point. If any other Senator is interested in his State I shall be very happy to furnish the information. In Oregon there are 3,990 wheat crop insurance contracts this year.

Last year Congress authorized adding cotton to the program theretofore confined to wheat. So there has been only 1 year's experience relating to that commodity.

The following figures will show the manner in which the farmers in the cotton areas have come forward to participate in this program.

In Texas, 54,000; in Georgia, 25,000; in South Carolina, 20,000; in Alabama, 12,000; in Louisiana, 11,000; in Oklahoma, 9,000; in North Carolina, 9,000; in Mississippi, 9,000; in Arkansas, 8,000; in Missouri, 3,990.

Allow me to say that anyone who attempts to speak with any degree of assurance as to the permanent outcome of this program is either holding out false hopes, or does not really understand what he is talking about. It has taken 5 years—from 1938 to the present time—to survey this country as to the number of wheat farms, the conditions on each farm, and the approximate yield over a period antedating this insurance, so as to obtain all the facts and determine the premium rate which must be applied. That is not a slight job; it is a tremendous undertaking.

As has been said before, there was a fundamental mistake in the original act. The original act forbade contracts to be written for periods of more than 1 year. That was a grievous mistake. Nobody was to blame. Crop insurance was a new thing. We are struggling for a desirable end. We are charting untraveled roads, and seas over which no ships of experience have passed. So we spent 5 years and twenty-odd million dollars in accumulating this experience. The term period has already been changed from 1 year to 3 years. That is extremely important, for the reason that in every wheat belt of the country the prospects for a crop depend largely upon the condition of the soil. When the seed is put into the ground—I know it is so in Kansas where wheat is sown in September—if there is plenty of moisture in the ground in August and September, the farmer feels he does not need much insurance, that he can be fairly sure of having a good crop, but in Oklahoma, Kansas, eastern Colorado, and Nebraska, if in August there is a dry soil, and no water in the subsoil, the chances of obtaining a crop are not very good and the farmer takes out insurance.

That has been corrected; but so long as the 1-year-term contract was followed this was an impossible thing, and the law tied the hands of the administrator of this program for 3 years before the administration could change that one feature.

There have been a number of other features which have been improved. Originally the county average for the year on the farms was taken. That was wrong, too. It meant that the poorest farm could be insured on the basis of the yield of the average farm of the county. That was stopped, and now the individual farm is the basis, which is the only way to operate safely.

I have been much interested in this program. It contemplates what seems to be a simple thing, but which in reality is difficult. As I have previously said, the fear of a crop failure overhangs the farmer all the time. If by concerted action we can provide him with insurance, which is only spreading out the risk from an individual basis to a wider basis, so as to remove that fear from the farmer, we have done a very definite thing that improves his mental and financial condition. Mr. President, there was no way that this could be done except the way that it has been attempted and is being carried on.

We have now sufficient experience so that we can look forward with some

degree of hope that in 3 years more the program will be on a sound basis. I should not want to hold out to my colleagues that, in my opinion, it can be settled in less than 3 years. If at the end of 3 years our experience during that time demonstrates that it is not feasible, and we cannot work out a satisfactory program, then, by all means, I am willing to let go, but I urge upon my colleagues that here is a program which does not call for subsidies, which does not call for charity, and which does not call for alms.

The Government is helping temporarily, yes, through the initial period; there is no other way to do it, but what we are trying to do is to improve the farmer's economic and mental situation so as to give him insurance for which he himself, not the Government, will pay. We are not asking any participation by the Government and do not expect any. We are trying to work it out on a safe basis.

Now I want to refer for a moment or two to what I regard as the unreasonableness of the House conferees. The House wrote into this bill an appropriation for this year of \$3,500,000, and then undertook to say that no part of the appropriation could be used to carry this program beyond the 31st of July of this year. The Senate increased the appropriation of \$3,500,000 to \$7,818,748. So far as the money is concerned, that was the difference between the two Houses.

I am not a member of the conference committee, but I am a member of the subcommittee that prepared this bill. I talked with all the Government agencies whose representatives appeared before the committee, and I want to say unhesitatingly that the Federal Crop Insurance Administration is easily the most efficiently handled and most economical of any agency that came before the committee. I think I can demonstrate that. All the other agencies want more money. This agency came and took what the Senate had written into the bill, which was the Budget estimate. We found afterwards that this had happened: Cotton was added only last year, and there were expected to be about twice as many contracts as were actually written. So after the estimate was made, an appropriation was provided of a little more than \$8,000,000 for the use of this agency. They did not have as many contracts as it was thought they would have; the cotton contracts were only about half what was anticipated and what had been appropriated for.

I discovered yesterday morning, in pursuing this matter further, that this agency had on hand unexpended \$1,600,000. They had not spent it all. Most Government agencies, according to my experience, would have gone ahead and spent it all. So I tried to figure out some basis on which we could meet the House. As I have said, I am not one of the conferees; but I have been so much interested that I intruded on the conferees yesterday and made a suggestion to them. After a conference in the morning with the responsible officers of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, I suggested that we would take the figure of \$3,500,000, which the House had written into the bill; that we would reap-

propriate the unexpended balance of \$1,600,000; that the Senate would recede from its appropriation of \$7,818,000; that we would strike out the language, liquidating, as Mr. DIRKSEN said, this program after July 31.

The conferees permitted me to intrude upon them yesterday. I laid the suggestion before them, I called attention to what could be done; I conferred with the representatives of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation only yesterday morning, and they agreed that could and would carry on this program according to what I have said.

I called the attention of the conferees to the fact that there are outstanding 487,000 3-year wheat-crop contracts of insurance now in existence. I want to say here that the answer I got from the spokesman of the House conferees was this: "Is not the Senator familiar with the fact that in every insurance contract there is written a provision that it may be terminated if Congress fails to appropriate sufficient money?"

I told the House chairman that I certainly knew that, but, certainly, I had no intentions, so far as I was concerned, of letting the Congress of the United States authorize a program for 3 years, have it signed up by 487,000 farmers, and then walk out on them. That may be the conception on the part of the House of good faith and governmental ethics, it certainly is not mine.

Mr. President, I deeply regret that the very able chairman of the subcommittee handling this bill, the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], felt he had to come before the Senate and move that the Senate recede. He stated this morning how he felt about it. He makes the motion against his own heart and against his own desire, and said so this morning. He feels, however, that it is rather necessary for him, in view of the parliamentary situation, to take such action. I regret that he feels that way about it.

I wish to read again the sentence which shows how Mr. DIRKSEN feels about it:

It ought to be liquidated, and if necessary we should go on record once more in an overwhelming way as an admonition to the Senate as to how we feel about the continuation of this program.

I am appealing to the Senate to go on record, in the vote that is about to be taken on the motion of the Senator from Georgia, to make plain in an overwhelming manner how it feels about keeping the faith with these 487,000 farmers in the United States.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, all the world is hungry except the Nation in which we are fortunate to live. A year from now, 2 years from now, that hunger will be worse, and we, too, may have our first taste of it, for the first time in the history of our Nation. We shall be forced to fall back upon the more economically produced food, such as wheat and soybeans. The two amendments which the Senate has under discussion can have great effect upon how much food will be available in 1944 and 1945 for us and our allies. On April

1 of this year, we had the largest supply of wheat on hand in our history, but as every Senator knows, we will be forced to feed much of that wheat to livestock during the coming year, or until such time as the numbers of our livestock are reduced again to normal, or below normal levels.

In anticipation of these great needs, plans have already been completed to attempt to increase our wheat acreage to 68,000,000 acres for the crop of next summer. That acreage would be about 15,000,000 above the 53,000,000 acres now in the ground. That means nearly a 30-percent increase. If we succeed in securing this great increase, we will be only 5,000,000 acres short of the record plantings of 1919, and 2,000,000 acres short of the plantings in 1938. Most of that wheat will be planted this fall. The wheat farmer, who, like all farmers, is hard pressed for labor, must make his decision throughout the winter-wheat area in the next 8 to 12 weeks as to whether or not we shall secure this increased acreage. The Senate should think twice before yielding on benefit payments and crop insurance for the wheat farmers.

If we fail to provide crop payments, which this year will be 9.7 cents per bushel on the normal yield of the farmers' allotment, what incentive will that be for the winter-wheat and spring-wheat producer to go all-out next year? If we withdraw the opportunity for wheat producers to secure crop insurance, and thus tell them that the Congress and the Government of the United States refuse to offer them any protection against crop failure, how likely is the wheat grower to make an all-out effort?

Mr. President, the cash price of wheat today is below the 85 percent of parity loan already announced on the crop now coming in. More than that, the futures for September and December wheat based upon the present crop prospects for a normal yield and upon the present supply and demand, are also below 85 percent of parity. Although I opposed it, this body has withdrawn authorization for parity payments on next year's wheat crop. We cannot tell the farmer that he can with any certainty expect to receive more than 85 percent of parity for his 1944 crop; indeed, we cannot assure him of even that return, in view of the shortage of storage space, which may prevent him from securing a commodity loan at 85 percent of parity.

I may add that last year thousands of farmers in North Dakota were unable to secure loans at 85 percent of parity. Every farmer whose wheat had an unusually high moisture content had difficulty. The appraiser would go into the granary, and if the moisture content was just a trifle high, one-eighth of 1 percent, he would refuse to make the loan.

The wheat farmer is the only producer of a basic crop who is not securing parity or very nearly parity, or considerably in excess of parity price. If we fail to authorize the War Food Administrator to contract with wheat farmers for crop payments for 1944, then it will

take around \$150,000,000 to make up for wheat farmers the difference between the loan return and full parity. Who knows what the conditions will be in 1945, when we would be called upon to make this appropriation? Who can say with any certainty that the Congress would then carry out what should be a moral obligation under the A. A. A. law, which will be the law of the land, at least when our winter-crop wheat is planted this fall? How can any Senator stand here and say that we are affording wheat producers equal treatment with other farmers, let alone with our industrialists and other producers of vital war materials, when at the same time that we call upon our wheat growers to make a 30-percent increase in acreage, we withdraw three of the four income protections which we have afforded them in peacetime?

I know that the former Food Administrator, Mr. Davis, told our subcommittee that perhaps 85 percent of parity would be enough reward for the wheat producer. Mr. President, I doubt the judgment displayed by the former Food Administrator in that regard, when he agreed with the position taken by the House in this matter. As long as the parity law is on the books, I do not see how we can repeal it indirectly for one crop, while guaranteeing it for other crops, and I want to offer my strong objections to the action taken by our conferees in receding on amendment 92. I do not know if the new Food Administrator has had opportunity to make his decision in this matter known to any Member of the Congress. I would think that we should hesitate before tying his hands as he assumes the heavy responsibilities of that post.

Mr. President, I come now to the other item remaining in dispute with the other body. More than 20 years ago in my State the farmers were campaigning for crop insurance. When they secured control of the State government through the Non-Partisan League, they attempted, within the limits of one State, to furnish themselves that elemental protection against risks not of their own making but from acts of Nature.

In the State of North Dakota crop insurance against damage by hail has been a tremendous success. We have saved the farmers there, in hail insurance alone, nearly \$50,000,000, as compared with the price they would have had to pay for old-line insurance. Not only that, but we have millions of dollars available today with which to pay losses.

The organized farmers of the West have never ceased between then and now to hope and work for an even more practical method of crop insurance. When, in 1938, this was at last secured on one crop, they felt that our Nation had at long last given them some equality of treatment as compared with the many privileges extended to other economic groups. Mr. President, if we recede and concur with the position taken by the House, we do not repeal thereby the Crop Insurance Act, but we are serving warning that it is the intention of the Congress to repeal that act when the last of the present 3-year contracts ex-

pire in 1945. Is that to be the reward of this Congress to the wheat and cotton producers for helping to win the war?

Mr. President, I know the desire of the other body, and perhaps of some of my colleagues, to recess and go home. But, Mr. President, I believe that we should make our position unmistakably clear. I believe we should make yet another offer through our conferees to find some middle ground not having such disastrous effects, in the hope that perhaps we may find unexpected support on the other side. As for myself, I believe we should force, if necessary, the postponement of the congressional recess in order to make clear to the country and clear to the farmers that we are not a party to this sectional and partisan attack upon the cotton and wheat growers of the Nation. But in any case, Mr. President, I can assure the Senate that if we ultimately are forced to give in to the circumstances created by the delays of the other body and its Appropriations Committee in what I consider to be a deliberate effort to place this House at a disadvantage, I, and I am sure many of my colleagues, will move at the earliest possible moment following the recess to restore such damage. And, Mr. President, if the action of the other body does prevail, I can assure the Senate that the day will come when millions of our farmers will again be stirred to action in defense of their homes and their rights.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wish to say a word in opposition to the motion made by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] that the Senate recede from its amendment with respect to the extension of crop insurance. This morning the Senate Committee on Commerce reported favorably the flood-control bill, introduced by the able Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], providing out of the Federal Treasury \$15,000,000 to compensate the farmers who sustained losses from the floods which have just swept over the Mississippi Valley.

Mr. President, I voted to report that measure. I imagine the Senate will vote for such a measure. I hope the Congress will authorize it, and that the President will approve it, because certainly the farmers who have sustained loss from this act of God are entitled to assistance from their Government. The time has passed when the National Government will look with callous eye upon people who have been the victims of misfortune which came to them through no fault of their own.

Mr. President, the expenditure of \$15,000,000 has been recommended today by one of the standing committees of the Senate, every dime of which will go to compensate farmers who sustained losses to their crops or croplands. Yet here it is proposed that the Senate recede from a provision which would allow the continuation of crop insurance, when only three and a half million dollars is essentially involved, as I was advised a few minutes ago by the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who is now within hearing of my voice.

Mr. President, if we take such action we shall be penny-wise and pound-foolish. I know, of course, that the crop in-

insurance applies only to wheat and cotton at the present time in the order which I have named them. But I know that it was contemplated in the first place that the principle of crop insurance should be applied eventually to all crops, at least to those crops with respect to which the Department of Agriculture had been able to work out reliable actuarial data.

I do not mind confessing that we who are interested in citrus production, not only in Florida but in Texas and Arizona and California, have been urging upon the Department of Agriculture the study of citrus fruit and the compilation of actuarial data which may make possible the development of the citrus industry of the Nation. The Department has compiled such data, and says to us that if it were peacetime the Department would recommend, on the basis of the data already accumulated, a crop-insurance plan for the citrus industry.

Mr. President, if a freeze were to strike my State it would practically bankrupt the State. It would make bank after bank fail; it would ruin producer after producer, and packer after packer. In such event we might be here asking some recompense from the Congress because of disasters of this nature against which we would be unable to protect ourselves.

Mr. President, I do not know of any industry more hazardous than the farming industry. The poor farmer gambles against the market and gambles against Nature, and lucky, indeed, is he who in a season wins both gambles.

I have been present at meetings of fruit and vegetable growers in Florida, and I have heard them testify that as many as four crops in succession have been utterly lost because they have been unable to make them, by reason of one hazard or another which has intervened. The result is that it is possible only for the rich man to carry on that kind of farming and the little fellow is entirely excluded from the industry.

Mr. President, the crop-insurance plan is a cooperative plan. As Senators know, essentially the Government only fixes the premium and takes the responsibility for miscalculation in the amount fixed, and pays the overhead of operating the plant. So essentially, and in the long run, the only cost to the Federal Government will be the overhead cost of operating the plant. From the viewpoint of the drain on the Federal Treasury, would not that be the best insurance we could have, as against such a claim upon our good will as the one in the Senate Committee on Commerce honored this morning to the extent of \$15,000,000? If it had been the wheat crop which had sustained injury from an act of nature, and if the crop-insurance plan were continued in effect, we would not have had to recompense sufferers by means of the appropriation of money from the Federal Treasury. They would have been entitled to recompense from the reserve which would have been established and protected by the Federal Government.

So, Mr. President, while the so-called wave of economy is sweeping the country, let us not actually cut off our noses

to spite our faces. Let us not commit the folly of extravagance under the guise of economy.

Some years ago a number of persons thought it was extravagant to build public roads. Now no one considers that other than a wise investment. Not many years ago some persons thought the expenditure of money for public education was extravagance and profligacy. Mr. President, niggardly economy was responsible for the humiliating fact that a few days ago, in a certain receiving center of the United States Army in a certain State, as attested by a witness on the scene, of 600 white boys who passed through the receiving center, 193 were rejected because they could neither write nor sign their names nor read a line. Of 600 white boys 193 were rejected because of illiteracy from the service of their country in its hour of greatest trial, due to the fact that someone practiced false economy.

Not only that, Mr. President, but through February of this year 300,000 men between the ages of 18 and 44 were rejected from selective service because they were illiterate. Not only that, Mr. President, but 2,997,000 American men and boys between the ages of 18 and 44 are unable to wear the uniform of their country and help fight its battles, because they have been rejected because of educational, mental, physical, or moral deficiency—nearly 3,000,000 of our fellow Americans, Mr. President. Someone kept those boys out of the hospitals or kept them out of the schools or denied them adequate training because it was thought it would cost too much money to provide such care or education. The country lost the services of those men. Many a married man left behind him a wife or children, to take the place in the armed services of an illiterate man or boy with lesser dependents and obligations, who should have had the married man's place in his country's service, and who would have had it if he had had greater opportunity somewhere along the trail of his life.

Mr. President, I am sure Senators are able to discriminate and differentiate between what may properly be dispensed with and what by all means should be preserved of the good things we have done in the past.

We all know how difficult the farming problem is. I am not a farmer, but in my State we have much farming activity. A great deal of farming is hazardous. Certainly, if the farmer wrestles with the market, that is enough of a contest. He has never been able for long to best that one enemy. When we contemplate the struggle with the vicissitudes of inclement weather and the hazards of Nature, Mr. President, we see that we make the farmer the greatest gambler in the land.

The proposal is to set up a cooperative plan in which the farmer may participate, and by means of which in the long run the farmers themselves will pay all the premiums and will create all the reserves, the Government paying only the overhead. I say such a step is in the direction of steadying and stabilizing the

position of the farmer, diminishing his hazards, reducing his gambles, and making him more assuredly self-supporting and self-sustaining.

Therefore, I hope that when only \$3,500,000 is involved, we shall not stifle in its early inception the establishment of a principle which has prospect of becoming one of the greatest contributions we can make to the preservation of the American farmer.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, let me say first that no boys from my State have been rejected from Army service because of illiteracy, because my State happens to have its school system so arranged that everyone can get an education, and the State appropriates sufficient money for the purpose.

However, I am gratified to hear the Senator from Florida take the stand he has taken with reference to legislation for crop insurance, even though his State does not now benefit by it to any extent whatever. If Members of the Senate could have gone into the States of Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota a few years ago and have seen for themselves what the farmers in certain sections of those States had to endure during a period of 6 or 7 long years of drought, not a Member of the Senate would vote against providing crop insurance.

I recall that my late distinguished colleague, Senator Walsh, and I took a trip through northeastern Montana, bordering on the Canadian line on the one hand, and on the North Dakota line on the other. Due to the drought conditions in that area, the girls had to wear overalls because their folks were unable to buy them ordinary clothes. They had to go without shoes. Eventually the Red Cross had to help. Senator Walsh and I returned to Washington. We appealed to the Red Cross to furnish those boys and girls with clothes, so that they could go to school that fall. Not only that, but a great many of the farmers who had come to Montana were compelled to leave their farms and go to work in factories. As a result, the owners of the larger farms and men of money bought the farms which were abandoned, and many were turned over to the insurance companies. So today there are fewer operators of small farms in that area because they could not take the risks the operators of the large farms could take.

After that, the people of Montana advocated hail insurance. Then the Government of the United States provided for crop insurance.

Let me say to the Members of the Senate that while many of the farmers are prosperous, the wheat farmers are not. Today the cattle raisers and sheep raisers are prosperous; probably they are two of the most prosperous farm groups. But the wheat farmer in my State is one of the few farmers in the country who is not getting parity for his products.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I have to leave the floor, and I wish to ask a question. If

the wheat growers of the Senator's State were to sustain the kind of loss which would entitle them to any appreciable amount of compensation under the crop insurance plan, if the crop-insurance plan were not in effect is it not probable that in one way or another they would appeal to the Government for help in meeting their losses?

Mr. WHEELER. Of course. That is exactly what they had to do. During the drouth years we asked for and we got, an appropriation from the Treasury of the United States in order to give the farmers enough food and enough clothes to see them through the winter.

Although we have not had such a situation in the last 2 or 3 years, I am told that conditions this year have been bad. The season has been very wet. As a result of the long wet season, I am told the wheat farmers have not been able to put in their crops. Unless there is a very long growing season there may be a crop failure this year.

We hear much said about a shortage of food. We want the wheat farmer to plow more ground and put in more crops. I do not know how he will be able to do it. I am sure that a good many farmers are not going to do it. They are not going to take the gamble if they know that they can not insure their crops. Many of them will say, "We will go into the defense industries in Seattle, Portland, San Francisco, or somewhere else, where we can get \$8, \$10, \$12 or \$15 a day rather than stay on the farm and take a chance, work long hours, and perhaps after all lose our crops and get no insurance."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do not wish to divert the Senator from the line of his argument, but there is one point which it seems to me should be taken into consideration. As I understand, this program was put into operation for the first time in the crop season of 1939. Therefore we have had only that much experience. In an enterprise of this kind, entering a new field, with all the hazards which confront the production of cotton and wheat, it is obvious that some time is necessary to gain the experience which would afford a sound actuarial basis. If this program is cut off now, it may be said that all the money which has been spent in getting this much experience will be wasted.

Mr. WHEELER. Exactly. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

The question has been asked, Why should the Government continue with the program when it is losing money? Practically every insurance company which has ever started without experience has lost money at the outset for a considerable period. We have gained some experience during the period of operation of the crop-insurance program. It may be that the Department has been too wasteful in some respects; it may be that it has not had employees with the necessary experience; but surely the Department has now had some experience. In my judgment it is doing a good job.

I agree with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. If I had my way, I would insist on the Senate amendment from now until doomsday, before I would let the House say that we must eliminate the crop-insurance program, which has been of such great benefit to the wheat growers. I cannot speak for the cotton growers, but I do know that the program has been of great benefit to the wheat growers in my State and in other areas in the great Northwest.

It would not be fair to end the program now. Let me say to my Republican friends in the Senate, as well as those in the House who have voted to abandon the program, that if they think they are making friends among the farmers of the country by eliminating an appropriation of approximately \$3,000,000 for crop insurance for the farmers in the Northwest, they are making a sad mistake. They will turn every farmer in that section of the country against them if they cut off crop insurance, which is so vital to them.

Mr. President, I have been through that territory. I have seen wheat farmers come to the Northwest from Indiana, Massachusetts, and many other States to take up homesteads. I have seen the little shacks in which they have lived. I have seen how their wives and children live in those shacks. I know something of the hardships which their wives have endured. I have seen some of them taken to insane asylums. The only thing that causes me to wonder is that so many of them stuck through the tough, hard years of homesteading on those farms, and endured the trials and tribulations through which they had to pass. Hardly any other class of American citizens would go through what the farmers of North Dakota and eastern Montana have gone through.

Sometimes we hear talk about the hardships of some industrial workers. This morning I received a letter from a union man saying the farmers were getting too much for their products. I venture the assertion that the man who wrote the letter is receiving \$300 or \$400 a month, whereas a farmer on a small farm is fortunate if he can make \$300 or \$400 a year after paying the expenses of his family.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. REED. The Senator very pertinently mentioned the political phase of this question. I ask the Senator, On whom do those who talk about individual enterprise have to depend most?

Mr. WHEELER. They must depend on the farmer. The farmer is the backbone of conservatism and free enterprise. If we eliminate the farmer and drive him from the farm into the industrial centers, we shall not have a capitalistic system in the United States. On the one hand we shall have the big industrialists, and on the other hand the workers.

Mr. REED. Let me ask the Senator another question. I would not have presumed to mention the Republican Party—

Mr. WHEELER. I thought the Senator was one of its leaders.

Mr. REED. What chance does the Senator from Montana think the Republican Party would have if it should lose the farmers of Michigan, Kansas, and Nebraska?

Mr. WHEELER. It would have about as much chance as the proverbial snowball in hades. If it should turn against the farmer, it would not deserve any more chance than that.

Mr. REED. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. WHEELER. It is stupid on the part of anyone, whether he be a businessman, a professional man, or a worker, to seek to destroy the farmers by failing to provide \$3,000,000 for crop insurance. A day or so ago we appropriated in excess of \$70,000,000,000 for the Army for the purpose of carrying on war, for the purpose of destruction; and yet we hesitate to vote three or four million dollars for production, for keeping the farmer in his home and for keeping alive the little rural communities, churches, and homes. When we talk about destroying the farmer and driving him off the farm by refusing to give him crop insurance, we are not thinking in terms of preserving democratic institutions in the United States.

Mr. President, I am not speaking on the basis of hearsay. I am not a farmer, but I have been through that territory time and time again. I have visited the homes of wheat farmers in the Northwest. I know the sufferings, trials, and tribulations through which they have passed. The crop-insurance law was enacted largely for the purpose of giving some kind of assurance to the wheat farmers. Later the cotton farmers were included. If we destroy crop insurance, we shall drive the farmers off the farms and into the factories. So I hope that the motion of my good friend the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] that the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 98 and 99 to House bill 2481.

Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. McNARY, and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LANGER. As I understand, Senators who wish to vote in favor of crop insurance should vote "nay." Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the calling of the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness. I am advised that if present and voting the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay."

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Louisiana

[Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained in important committee meetings.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] are detained in Government departments on matters pertaining to their respective States.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] are necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent on official business as a member of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] is unavoidably detained in committee meeting.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 53, as follows:

YEAS—21

Bilbo	Lodge	Russell
Bridges	McKellar	Stewart
Chandler	Maloney	Tydings
Chavez	Mead	Van Nuys
George	Moore	Wagner
Hayden	Radcliffe	Wherry
Kilgore	Revercomb	Wilson

NAYS—53

Aiken	Green	Pepper
Andrews	Guffey	Reed
Austin	Gurney	Robertson
Ball	Hill	Scruggam
Bankhead	Holman	Shipstead
Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Brewster	La Follette	Taft
Brooks	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Buck	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Burton	McCarran	Tobey
Capper	McFarland	Truman
Caraway	McNary	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Vandenberg
Connally	Millikin	Wallgren
Danaher	Murdoch	Wheeler
Davis	Murray	White
Downey	Nye	Willis
Ferguson	O'Daniel	

NOT VOTING—22

Bailey	Ellender	O'Mahoney
Barbour	Gerry	Overton
Bone	Gillette	Reynolds
Bushfield	Glass	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Hatch	Walsh
Byrd	Hawkes	Wiley
Clark, Idaho	Johnson, Calif.	
Eastland	McClellan	

So Mr. RUSSELL's motion was rejected.

Mr. RUSSELL. I move that the Senate further insist on its amendments still in disagreement, request a further conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. BANKHEAD,

Mr. SMITH, Mr. NYE, and Mr. McNARY conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

WATER CONSERVATION AND UTILIZATION PROJECTS

During the course of the debate relating to crop insurance,

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider Senate bill 1252. I have discussed the matter with the majority and minority leaders, and have received their approval for consideration of the measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The title of the bill will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1252) to amend the act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1418), as amended by the act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 119), relating to water conservation and utilization projects.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the Senator from North Dakota objects to the consideration of this bill, and another bill of similar nature? Let me say to the Senator that these two bills are exceedingly important in connection with the program for food production, and are in keeping with the desires of the Food Administrator, with the idea that we may have a greater production of food in the sections of the country where production of food is made available by irrigation.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have no objection to consideration of the measure provided these proceedings will be placed in the RECORD following my discussion of the question of crop insurance. Several Senators have already discussed crop insurance, and it is my purpose to say a few words about it.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota desires to speak on the important subject of crop insurance, and wishes his remarks on the subject to be placed in the RECORD immediately following the speech made by the senior Senator from North Dakota, and the discussion which followed his speech.

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from North Dakota does not wish to yield if the consideration of the bill will lead to discussion.

Mr. McCARRAN. I will say that I do not believe consideration of the two bills which I propose to take up will lead to extended discussion, but if the Senator from North Dakota is of a different mind, and believes that too great a break would occur in the sequence of the discussion in which he is interested, I will not press the matter.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say that he had agreed to recognize the junior Senator from North Dakota following the speech of the senior Senator from North Dakota. He understood, however, that the Senator from Nevada had conferred with the junior Senator from North Dakota about two

bills; that is the reason why the Senator from Nevada was recognized.

Mr. McNARY. I ask unanimous consent that the matter now under discussion be placed in the RECORD following the speech to be made by the junior Senator from North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HILL. May I ask the Senator from Nevada, are the projects covered by the bill located in more than one State?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes, the projects are located in 17 States. They are projects which come under two acts of Congress, one known as the Wheeler-Case Act, and the other the General Reclamation Act.

Senate bill 1252 would amend the Wheeler-Case Act so certain irrigation projects may be authorized, and appropriations therefor made when, as and if Congress makes appropriations. Both bills are approved by the Secretary of the Interior. They are approved by the Food Administrator. They have received unanimous vote in the Senate Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Mr. HILL. Are all Senators from the 17 States in question in full agreement concerning the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. I should say emphatically "yes." So far as I know, they all are in agreement respecting the bill.

Mr. HILL. I understood the Senator to say that the Secretary of the Interior has approved the bill, also the Food Administrator, as well as the Senators from the 17 States involved, and that the bill has received the unanimous approval of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is true, Mr. President. There is a letter in the RECORD from the head of the War Production Board in which he gives his approval in principle to the policy of the bill.

Mr. HILL. The head of the War Production Board has joined with the Secretary of the Interior and the Food Administrator in favoring the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it may be appropriate to state that the Senate, in the Interior Department appropriation bill, has already taken action on appropriation for reclamation, which is altogether in harmony with the measure which the Senator from Nevada is now urging upon the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. That is what I wanted to ask. What relation have the two bills referred to by the Senator from Nevada to the projects which were approved in the Interior Department appropriation bill recently passed?

Mr. McCARRAN. No appropriations have been made for the purposes set forth in the two bills. They merely provide authorizations. The appropriations would have to come when, as, and if the Secretary of the Interior, after having made survey and examination of the land, should see fit to ask Congress for an appropriation.

Mr. TAFT. What relation have the bills to the action we took recently in the Interior Department appropriation bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. They have no relation whatever to that action, except that the Interior Department appropriation bill carries sanction for the provisions contained in the bill. No appropriation is now proposed to be made for the purposes of these bills.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, may I ask if the proposal would require additional and favorable reports from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and action on the part of the Committee on Appropriations? I call attention to the fact that the Interior Department appropriation bill is now in conference.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. The report I have received is that the House is not going to yield even with respect to the projects contained in the appropriation bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. I understand that statement to be correct.

Mr. McNARY. So there is no relation in any way existing between the two bills and the Interior Department appropriation bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. There is no relation whatever.

Mr. HILL. Are both bills to which the Senator from Nevada has referred Senate bills?

Mr. McCARRAN. Both are Senate bills. Both bills have been approved by the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Mr. HILL. The bills were approved by unanimous report of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, as I understand.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I have not had time to read either bill. It is my understanding from a glance at the first paragraph of Senate bill 1252 that no more than \$2,000,000 can be charged to irrigation, or \$500,000 to flood control, on any one project. Does that provision refer to previously authorized projects only?

Mr. McCARRAN. Not altogether. Let me explain the matter to the Senator. Projects were previously authorized in which the W. P. A. and the Civilian Conservation Corps were involved. The W. P. A. and the Civilian Conservation Corps are out of the picture, so the bill would provide authority for appropriations, hereafter to follow, for the completion of the projects on which those agencies were working when they were put out of existence, and also, if the Secretary of the Interior should see fit to do so, to go forward under the Wheeler-Case Act, which is a law now, applying to the arid and semiarid regions of the West for small projects. The bill deals only with small projects in connection with which no great amount of money is involved in any instance, but where 160 acres or more of land may be put into production quite promptly.

Mr. AIKEN. The bill would not have any effect at all on the so-called public power projects, would it?

Mr. McCARRAN. Not at all. I specifically queried the Department of the Interior on that subject. No such matters are involved. Some power may be developed on some of the projects; but if power is developed, its use is limited to utilization within the project itself, not for sale to or to be utilized by the public generally.

Mr. AIKEN. If a dam costs \$4,000,000, the bill would provide that \$2,000,000 could be charged to irrigation, \$500,000 to flood control, and the remaining \$1,500,000 would have to be a direct appropriation by Congress; is that correct?

Mr. McCARRAN. A direct appropriation, but the amount might be repaid or charged to the land for repayment.

Mr. AIKEN. The bill would not apply to dams where power is produced for sale, would it?

Mr. McCARRAN. It would not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator whether any question of State-Federal relationships is involved in the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. Not in the least.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1252) to amend the act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1418), as amended by the act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 119), relating to water conservation and utilization projects.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not quite understand the report. The report refers to a committee amendment which does not seem to appear in the bill.

What I have in mind is that the report on Senate bill 1257, Calendar No. 375, states that "the following amendments were adopted by the committee"

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair informs the Senator that the bill now under consideration by the Senate is Senate bill 1252, Calendar No. 374. The Senator is referring to a different bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I understood that Senate bill 1252 had been passed by the Senate, and that the Senate now has under consideration Senate bill 1257, Calendar No. 375. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The parliamentary situation is that Senate bill 1252, Calendar No. 374, is under consideration by the Senate. The bill has not as yet been passed.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1252) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the last proviso of section 1 of the act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1418), as amended (hereinafter referred to as the act), is hereby amended to read as follows: "And provided further, That expenditures from appropriations made directly pursuant to the authority contained in section 12 (1) to meet reimbursable construction costs allocated to irrigation as defined in section 4 (b) shall not exceed \$2,000,000 for dams and reservoirs in any one project,

and that expenditures from appropriations made directly pursuant to the authority contained in section 12 (1) to meet costs allocated to flood control by the Secretary after consultation with the Chief of Engineers, War Department, shall not exceed \$500,000 on any one project."

Sec. 2. Subparagraph (vii) of subsection 3 (a) of the act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(vii) The part of the estimated cost which can properly be allocated to flood control as recommended by the Secretary after consultation with the Chief of Engineers, War Department."

Sec. 3. Subsection 3 (b) of the act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) No actual construction of the physical features of a project shall be undertaken unless and until (1) the Secretary has found that lands, or interests in lands, deemed necessary for the construction and operation of the major features of the projects have been secured, or sufficient progress made in their procurement to indicate the probability that all these lands or interests in lands can be secured, with titles and at prices satisfactory to him; and (2) the Secretary has found (1) that water rights adequate for the purposes of the project have been acquired with titles and at prices satisfactory to him, or that such water rights have been initiated and in his judgment can be perfected in conformity with State law and any applicable interstate agreements and in a manner satisfactory to him; and (ii) that such water rights can be utilized for the purposes of the project in conformity with State law and any applicable interstate agreements and in a manner satisfactory to him."

Sec. 4. Section 3 of the act is hereby amended by the addition of the following subsection:

"(c) Any part of a project hereunder may be designated as a division of the project by the Secretary if he, after consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, deems this desirable for orderly and efficient construction or administration. The term 'project,' as used in subsection 3 (b) and section 4, shall be deemed to mean also 'division of a project,' designated as provided in this subsection. Any project authorized for construction from appropriations under the head 'Water Conservation and Utility Projects' in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1940 (53 Stat. 685), hereinafter called the 1940 water-conservation appropriation, may be designated by the Secretary, upon agreement with the Secretary of Agriculture, a project under this act and shall thereupon be subject to all the provisions and requirements thereof, except those of subsections 3 (a) and 3 (b)."

Sec. 5. Section 4 of the act is hereby amended by the addition of the following subsection:

"(d) For each project, on which construction is commenced or continued under this subsection, appropriations heretofore or hereafter made pursuant to section 12 and the unexpended balance of the 1940 water-conservation appropriation, in addition to being available for other authorized objects of expenditure, shall be available for expenditure, by the agency to which available, in lieu of the 'services, labor, materials, or other property, including money,' authorized to be utilized under section 2 and subsection 5 (b). All expenditures on each such project may be excluded (1) from the project construction costs to the extent the Secretary finds necessary to keep the reimbursable costs within the findings made under subsections 3 (a) (iv), 3 (a) (v), and 3 (a) (vi), and (2) from the costs that but for this subsection would be required to be returned under section 5, to the extent deemed necessary by the Secretary of Agriculture for the successful prosecution of the project; and as to each such project the limitations on expenditures provided in sections 1 and 9 shall be inoperative.

Appropriations made pursuant to section 12 shall be available for expenditures for continuation of construction on any project heretofore undertaken under the 1940 water-conservation appropriation, and such expenditures and those from the 1940 water-conservation appropriation may be excluded from the costs of any such project in determining the amounts required to be reimbursed, to the extent the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture jointly determine is necessary to keep reimbursable costs within the ability of the water users to repay. No project may be initiated for construction or, if heretofore authorized, continued under this subsection unless the Secretary, following consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, finds that the proposed construction under this subsection is justifiable as an aid in the production of needed agricultural products and the President approves said finding. The utilization of services or labor of prisoners of war under section 2 is authorized, subject to the approval of, and regulations by, the War Department or other Federal agency having control of said prisoners. From and after the date 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war as determined by proclamation of the President or concurrent resolution of the Congress, this subsection shall no longer be of any force or effect except as to projects on which construction has been initiated or continued under this subsection prior to said date."

Sec. 6. Section 5 of the act is hereby amended by the addition of the following subsection:

"(c) Where the aggregate amount involved does not exceed \$300, the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5) shall not apply to any purchase or service authorized for the Department of Agriculture under this act or under the 1940 water-conservation appropriation."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that there is a typographical error in the title of the bill. In the second line of the title, the figure "119" should be changed to read "1119."

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1418), as amended by the act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1119), relating to water conservation and utilization projects."

WARTIME CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF RECLAMATION PROJECTS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1257, Calendar No. 375.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be reported by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1257) authorizing wartime construction and operation and maintenance of reclamation projects.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, it seems to me that the provisions of the bill are extremely broad, giving general Federal power to operate irrigation systems anywhere and everywhere. I particularly desire to ask whether the report is correct in saying that certain amendments were agreed to. I read from the report:

The following amendments were adopted by the committee:

Page 2, line 17, change the colon to a period and insert after the period the following:

No such amendment appears in the copy of the bill I have. I do not know whether it is part of the bill or is not part of the bill. In any event, the

amendment is quite an extensive one. It provides that—

Municipal or miscellaneous water supply, electric power, or flood-control features may be constructed, operated, and maintained by the Secretary as incidental to and part of reclamation work undertaken pursuant to this act.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Ohio has directed my attention to what seems to be an error in the printing of the bill. In other words, as the bill comes before the Senate it should be printed showing the amendment in italics. However, the amendment does not appear in the bill as now printed. Therefore, I must ask that the matter be deferred until a later time, when it can be properly brought before the Senate.

SERVICEMEN'S DEPENDENCY ALLOWANCE AND OLD AGE PENSIONS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a few months ago, it was my privilege to introduce a bill providing for the partial amendment of the Servicemen's Dependency Allowance Act of 1942. Since that time, more than a dozen other bills, many of them exact duplications of each other, were also introduced to amend this act.

These bills have all laid buried in the Senate Military Affairs Committee until last Monday, when representatives of the War and Navy Departments met with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] to recommend certain vital changes in the organic structure of the Dependency Act—changes which prove that the Dependency Act has been riddled by practical application—changes which prove that what the Dependency Act really needs is a complete overhauling job, not just a few minor repairs.

Newspaper stories, especially the recent campaign conducted by the New York newspaper PM, have described the excruciating hardships imposed on the thousands of families of our fighting men as a result of the outworn provisions of the Dependency Act. If Congress recesses now, without taking some action to alleviate these sufferings—which also constitute a serious threat to the morale of the armed forces—we must then answer to the 3,500,000 persons throughout this Nation who have become the victims of military relief.

No bill yet proposed, including mine, is the solution to this critical situation. Congress must take the responsibility for a completely revamped Dependency Act, and if we prolong the country's agony until fall, we must be prepared to face the consequences.

Mr. President, I do not think Congress should take the recess proposed to be taken shortly without providing some form of assistance to the aged of the country. I ask Members of the Senate to remember that over 1,000,000 persons signed a petition in 1937 asking for old-age pensions. Yet to the present time no definite action in that respect has been taken.

Mr. President, I repeat that if nothing is done to raise the pay of the pri-

vates in our armed forces, hundreds of thousands of members of their families, if not millions, will actually suffer.

INVESTIGATION RESPECTING CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE OF FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report back favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 161, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 161), submitted on May 24, 1943, by Mr. SCRUGHAM (for himself, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. BUCK, and Mr. MOORE) and subsequently reported from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the construction and maintenance of highways, roads, streets, and bridges over which the United States Government, or any department or agency thereof, exercises or may exercise any jurisdiction or direction, directly or indirectly, as a part of the war effort or otherwise, including the allocation of materials, equipment, and manpower for the construction or maintenance thereof, and practices incidental thereto, whether private or governmental, which affect or may affect the use, construction, and maintenance of such highways, roads, streets, and bridges. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of such study and investigation, together with its recommendations for necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies of the Government, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$3,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of what the resolution proposes to do.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from New Hampshire that it is a resolution to investigate primarily a highway leading between continental United States and Fairbanks, Alaska. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] are members of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and I think those Senators are more familiar with what it is proposed

to do by the resolution than are the members of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Let me say further to the Senator from New Hampshire that this is another one of those resolutions that come to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate without any evidence and without any written report to substantiate them. I know nothing about the resolution at all; I know nothing about the facts other than what I have been told from time to time concerning the proposed investigation by the members of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

I repeat once more that, as chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate—and I know the other members of the committee will agree with me—I dislike to assume the responsibility in cases of this kind to recommend an appropriation without any facts to support it. I hope that in the future legislative committees, when resolutions are referred to them, will procure some evidence and submit a report to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, so that the members of that committee may ascertain whether the amount allowed should be \$3,500 or \$10,000 or \$25,000. I have made a similar statement repeatedly on the floor, but it does not seem to have done any good.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I inquire from what standing committee the resolution was reported?

Mr. LUCAS. It was reported from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. I have consulted with members of the minority and members of the majority of my committee, and they are all for it, but I make the statement I have made by way of explanation.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator himself does not know what investigation is being authorized; all he is going on is its face value?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not know why the investigation is to be made, I will frankly say to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to make an observation. I am not a member of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, but some time back in the winter charges were bandied around regarding the location of the highway to Alaska, and the matter came before the Committee on Foreign Relations. We had a hearing or investigation with respect to it, and took no action because we did not think there was any need for action. In spite of that, it seems it has been whispered around, and probably publicly stated, that there was something wrong with regard to the location of the highway. Those who are responsible for the location of the highway, as I understand, welcome an investigation in order that the facts may be revealed, and that what-

ever the facts may be they will satisfy the people, instead of having the matter bandied around from mouth to mouth that something was wrong in regard to it. It is for that reason, as I understand, that the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads reported the resolution and the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate was asked to provide the funds.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I was not present in the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads when this matter was considered, because, as every Senator knows, I have been very busily engaged for the last few weeks in the Appropriations Committee, and I have not kept up entirely with the work of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads; but I said to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], who is in charge of the subcommittee dealing with this matter, that whatever he and the committee did would meet my approval. I am approving it under those conditions.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. The building of highways by the United States Government primarily outside the United States is a matter involving a policy which is somewhat controverted. It is proposed to build a second highway through Canada for the purpose primarily, of maintaining access to Alaska, and there is also the question of side roads, feeder roads, to be built. That is the chief reason for the resolution.

Mr. BRIDGES. Am I to understand that it is for the purpose of investigating the so-called Alaskan Highway?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Primarily.

Mr. BRIDGES. With all its ramifications?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Yes, sir.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if the purpose of the resolution is to investigate the Alaskan Highway, why is it not so stated in the resolution? Why are the provisions of the resolution so broad?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. The resolution is drawn according to the standard form of resolutions and was prepared for us by the legislative counsel.

Mr. LODGE. The resolution covers—

Highways, roads, streets, and bridges over which the United States Government, or any department or agency thereof, exercises or may exercise any jurisdiction or direction, directly or indirectly, as a part of the war effort or otherwise, including the allocation of materials, equipment, and manpower for the construction or maintenance thereof.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. It was thought they should be included.

Mr. LODGE. Why should it not include overpasses and tunnels and roads in cities to relieve traffic conditions?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I think that authority is included.

Mr. LODGE. I think if this matter is to be gone into at all it should be gone into thoroughly, and we ought not to confine ourselves simply to highways and

bridges, when in a great many of our cities there is a very pressing problem connected with traffic through the cities which should be diverted.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. If it be so desired, such matters may be covered by the investigation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if I may interrupt the Senator from Nevada, let me say that I was led to support this resolution which has been reported by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate on the statement that it was intended to investigate the construction of a highway to Alaska.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. That is the primary purpose.

Mr. BARKLEY. If it means that the committee is to investigate the whole highway system of the United States, and whether there shall be superhighways built as a result of the war and future planning, a different situation is presented to me. I should like to know whether, under the resolution, it is intended to investigate all the highway systems of the United States and, if so, why it was not so stated.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. The only objective at the present time is that which has been stated. The reason for the wording of the resolution is that it is in the standard form of such resolutions.

Mr. BARKLEY. It may be a standard form of resolution, but any kind of standard form of resolution would indicate the limitation which would be imposed on the committee in its investigation.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. If I should suggest an amendment, would it be in order?

Mr. BARKLEY. It is always in order to amend anything before the Senate.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I shall suggest an amendment, the exact wording of which I shall prepare at once. I shall confine it to the objectives which have just been stated.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is the theory upon which I thought the resolution was offered.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is the theory I stated a moment ago, that is the theory on which the Senator from Nevada discussed the matter and other Senators discussed it with me.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. If I may be allowed, I shall furnish the wording. It will take only a moment or two.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think it would be advisable to do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

Mr. LUCAS. I still have the floor.

Mr. LODGE. The Presiding Officer asked whether there was objection, and I wanted the Record to show that I objected to acting on the resolution in its present form.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I merely wanted to say that several months ago, last year as I recall, a charge was made that the Alaskan Highway was being built in such

manner as to be a scandal. So a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations was appointed, of which the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] was chairman, and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] and I were members. We made quite an investigation. We had the Army engineers before us, and all those who were supposed to know anything about that particular highway.

We were told at that time that the highway could not be put into passable condition because of a certain kind of material on top of the ground, a sort of mud which would make it impossible to have a passable road. We were particularly told that bridges could not be constructed so as to make the highway passable.

The Army engineers convinced our committee, and we so reported, that the route chosen was the logical and sensible one on which to build the highway. I do not know whether the highway involved in the resolution is the one we considered, but up until that time, I think it was shown, it was costing about \$160 a ton, for the freight charge alone, to fly gasoline into Canada and Alaska. The subcommittee was perfectly satisfied that the proposed route was the proper one, and during last year the highway was built, and at least temporary bridges were constructed, so that the highway was passable last year.

The idea of the engineers at the time of the investigation was that they would build the road through the summer and fall months, and drive on the ice in the winter. I have been informed that the result was that the road was in condition to be used last winter.

There was apparently considerable opposition or rivalry between two or three possible routes. There were certain air routes which seemed to have preference for one or another of the routes, and apparently the charge that the one chosen was the wrong route grew out of that rivalry.

The Army engineers were so clearly of the opinion that the route selected was feasible that we reported that that was the proper route. I thought I should give this history.

Mr. LUCAS. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. What is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request of the Senator from Illinois has been objected to.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will yield, I am not objecting to having an investigation of the road to Alaska, but anyone who reads the phraseology of the resolution can see perfectly well that it is not at all restricted to Alaska; in fact, Alaska is not mentioned once. I certainly should be derelict in my duty if, in the case of a resolution even confined to highways, roads, streets, and bridges, I did not insist that it cover overpasses and underpasses, and everything else appropriate to relieve traffic congestion in cities. That is why I objected. I want the Senator from Nevada to understand I do not object to his proposal.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I think the objection will be answered if in line 5, after the word "bridges", we insert "in the Territory of Alaska", and omit lines 11, 12, and line 1 on page 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution not being before the Senate, it is not subject to amendment.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, as I heard him, I think the very distinguished Senator from Nevada said, "in the Territory of Alaska."

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. The road starts at Edmonton, Canada, and ends at White Horse.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Yes; the suggestion is very pertinent.

Mr. McNARY. A portion of the road lies out of the jurisdiction of the Territory of Alaska, if the Senator wants an investigation.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. That is a very pertinent suggestion, and it should read "in the Territory of Alaska and in Canada."

Mr. BARKLEY. With all due respect to the drafting of the resolution, in view of the comprehensive breadth of the language, which would permit an investigation of every road over which the Government hauls material anywhere in the United States, really what should be done would be to rewrite the resolution.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I object to the present consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There being objection, the resolution is not open to amendment, and it will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. LUCAS subsequently said: Mr. President, a few moments ago the Senate had under discussion Senate Resolution 161, dealing with the American-Canadian Highway. Some objection was made to the language of the resolution, and the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] has agreed to certain amendments, which I think will be satisfactory to all Members of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution not being before the Senate, it is not subject to amendment.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Has the objection of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] been met?

Mr. LUCAS. It has. He has approved it.

I ask unanimous consent to take the resolution from the calendar and have it considered now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, the resolution covers a very broad field. I do not doubt the wisdom of those who have approved it, but it is of great importance, and therefore I must object.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection for a moment, until I read the language to him? I do not believe he will object. As amended the resolution would read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, or any duly authorized

subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the construction and maintenance of the American-Canada Highway and proposed feeder roads, as a part of the war effort or otherwise, including the allocation of materials, equipment, costs, and manpower for the construction or maintenance thereof, and practices incidental thereto.

And so forth. In other words, the language "highways, roads, streets, and bridges over which the United States Government, or any department or agency thereof, exercises or may exercise any jurisdiction or direction, directly or indirectly" has been stricken from the resolution. It is limited solely to this one activity, and really should not be objectionable.

Mr. WILSON. With that understanding, I withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, may we have it read? Does it include highways from Mexico or only the American-Canadian Highway?

Mr. LUCAS. It does not include highways from Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 5, after the words "maintenance of", it is proposed to strike out "highways, roads, streets, and bridges over which the United States Government, or any department or agency thereof exercises or may exercise any jurisdiction or direction, directly or indirectly" and insert "the American-Canada Highway and proposed feeder roads"; in line 9, after the word "equipment", to insert "costs"; and in line 11, after the word "thereto", to insert a period and strike out "whether private or governmental, which affect or may affect the use, construction, and maintenance of such highways, roads, streets, and bridges."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 161), as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the construction and maintenance of the American-Canada Highway, and proposed feeder roads, as a part of the war effort or otherwise, including the allocation of materials, equipment, costs, and manpower for the construction or maintenance thereof, and practices incidental thereto. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of such study and investigation, together with its recommendations for necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and

places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies of the Government, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$3,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The title was amended so as to read: "Resolution authorizing an investigation of the American-Canada Highway and proposed feeder roads."

TRANSFER OF GASOLINE RATIONING TO PETROLEUM ADMINISTRATION FOR WAR

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, yesterday I informed the Senate that the Committee on Appropriations had voted unanimously to transmit an amendment of mine, which would take the gasoline rationing functions from the Office of Price Administration and put them in the hands of the Petroleum Administrator for War, to the Committee on Banking and Currency, with a plea for prompt action. At that time the Senator from Ohio raised the point that that was not the proper committee. Since then I have had a memorandum prepared by the counsel of the Senate going into that question in great detail, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By section 201 (b) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, approved January 30, 1942, the President was authorized to transfer to the Office of Price Administration "any of the powers and functions relating to priorities or rationing conferred by law upon any other department or agency of the Government with respect to any particular commodity or commodities."

On April 7, 1942, the President issued Executive Order 9125 which provides in part as follows:

"By virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and statutes of the United States, as President of the United States and as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and for the purpose of assuring the most effective prosecution of war procurement and production, it is hereby ordered, as follows:

"3. The Chairman of the War Production Board is authorized to delegate to the Office of Price Administration or the Price Administrator such of his functions, duties, powers, authority, or discretion with respect to priorities or rationing, as he may deem to be necessary or appropriate for the effective prosecution of the war; and in the administration or enforcement of any such priorities or rationing authority or any priorities or rationing authority heretofore conferred upon the Office of Price Administration or upon the Price Administrator by the Office of Production Management or by the Chairman of

the War Production Board, the Price Administrator is hereby authorized:

"(a) To exercise all functions, duties, powers, authority, or discretion with respect to such priorities or rationing in the same manner, and to the same degree and extent, as if such functions, duties, powers, authority, or discretion had been conferred upon or transferred to the Office of Price Administration directly by Executive Order.

"(d) To exercise, to the extent necessary for the purposes of this order, the functions, duties, powers, authority, or discretion conferred upon the President by paragraphs (3) and (4) of subsection (a) of section 2 of the act of June 28, 1941 (54 Stat. 676), as amended by the act of May 31, 1941 (Pub. Law 89, 77th Cong.), and by title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942 (act of March 27, 1942, Pub. Law 507, 77th Cong.).

"4. War Production Board Directives No. 1 of January 24, 1942 (7 F. R. 562), No. 1A of February 2, 1942 (7 F. R. 698), No. 1B of February 9, 1942 (7 F. R. 925), No. 1C of February 28, 1942 (7 F. R. 1669), and any other authorizations of the Office of Production Management or the War Production Board with respect to priorities or rationing, and all regulations or orders issued, or actions taken, by the Office of Price Administration or the Price Administrator pursuant to such directives or authorizations, are hereby, until withdrawn or superseded, continued in full force and effect, as if issued pursuant to this order or under authority conferred pursuant to this order. No provision of this order shall be construed to impair the right of the Administrator to maintain pending, or to institute, civil proceedings, or to take any other action with respect to violations prior to the date of this order of any priorities or rationing regulation or order heretofore issued."

INTERSTATE OIL COMPACT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, there is on the calendar Senate Joint Resolution 66, consenting to an interstate oil compact to conserve oil and gas. Order of Business No. 382 is a House joint resolution in identical form. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 139.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the joint resolution by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 139) consenting to an interstate compact to conserve oil and gas.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to have an explanation of the measure.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the joint resolution provides for consent to an interstate oil compact which has been entered into among the States of Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Colorado, New Mexico, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Kentucky.

I will say that in 1935, six States entered into a compact such as the present compact. Later on other States joined in that compact. The compact which we have before us has been signed by the Governors of all the States involved, and the secretaries of state of those States. I have spoken to the majority and minority leaders concerning the joint resolution, which was reported unanimously from the Committee on Mines and Mining. The Senate received a message from the President of the United States on June 28 transmitting the compact to the Senate. There is no

disagreement whatever with respect to it at any place along the line.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Colorado to proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 139.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate Joint Resolution 66 will be indefinitely postponed.

APPOINTMENT TO UNITED STATES MILITARY AND NAVAL ACADEMIES

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I call attention to Calendar 378, House bill 3026, and also Calendar 381, House bill 1991, for which I intend to ask consideration a little later. Before making the motion for consideration I wish to make an explanation of House bill 3026. It is necessary that this bill be passed before Congress takes a recess in order to retain for some of our colleagues in the House the right to make appointments to West Point and Annapolis. Certain States have been redistricted under the new census; consequently there are less districts in some States than there previously were, and appointments previously made from a district which has been merged into adjacent districts have been charged to Members of the House who live in the adjacent districts. Some Representatives would thus be limited in the appointments they may make until the appointees named from the old district have graduated from the academy.

The question arises, of course, as to whether the passage of the bill will result in increasing the number of cadets and midshipmen at the academies. Of course it will, because when one State lost a House Member another State gained one. So the State which gained a House Member will have four more cadets and four more midshipmen, and the State which lost a Member will have the number heretofore appointed until those now in the academies are graduated. I believe the situation which now exists should be corrected. The bill has passed the House. I now move that the Senate proceed to consider House bill 3026.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3026) relating to appointments to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy in the case of redistricting of congressional districts.

Mr. GURNEY. I wish to make a little further explanation of the measure. Two years ago, as I recall, we gave the academic boards at both West Point and Annapolis the right to keep the academies up to maximum strength by filling vacancies from qualified alternates. Consequently, when we retain to the sitting Members of the House their right to appoint, it will simply cut down the

number of qualified alternates who might otherwise be appointed to the academies. I believe the bill to be well worth while, and it should pass immediately in order quickly to become law.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. How many additional cadets and midshipmen will be appointed?

Mr. GURNEY. The bill does not actually provide for additional cadets and midshipmen. Those who are there now from the districts which have been done away with will remain there until they graduate.

Mr. WILLIS. There will be additions from the new districts, will there not?

Mr. GURNEY. There will be additions from the new districts in the States which gained House Members.

Mr. WILLIS. How many appointments will there be altogether?

Mr. GURNEY. I do not have the exact figures. Whatever new districts were created in one State were lost in another.

Mr. WILLIS. Do the academy boards approve of this measure?

Mr. GURNEY. Both the Military Academy and the Naval Academy boards have approved the measure and requested that it be enacted into law.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. Will the passage of this measure mean that in the event a Member of Congress now has a vacancy because of the failure of a candidate to qualify in the last month or two, such vacancy might be filled by an alternate from another district or State?

Mr. GURNEY. No, the purpose of the measure is to correct that situation, and to keep for the House Member the privilege of filling the vacancy. He would lose that privilege if he should fail to pass the bill.

Mr. MALONEY. The bill has no application to the Senate?

Mr. GURNEY. No, it has no application to the Senate.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. Is it not true that the issue involved in this measure is that either a Representative will be permitted to make appointments to fill vacancies, or the boards of the two academies may fill vacancies? If vacancies are not filled by congressional appointment each year, the academic boards may fill up the cadet or midshipman personnel to the required strength?

Mr. GURNEY. The Senator is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Dakota.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill (H. R. 3026) relating to appointments to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy in the case of redistricting of congressional districts, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

POSTPONEMENT OF INDUCTION OF CERTAIN HIGH-SCHOOL STUDENTS

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate proceed to consider House bill 1991, Calendar No. 381.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Dakota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1991) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the postponement of the induction of high-school students who have completed more than half of their academic year, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the word "while" to strike out the word "satisfactorily"; and in the same line before the word "course", to strike out the word "normal"; on page 2, line 4, after the word "ceases to", to strike out "perform satisfactorily", and to insert "pursue"; and on the same page, line 9, after the word "pursue", to strike out "satisfactorily."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MARKETING OF BURLEY AND FLUE-CURED TOBACCO

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the House has passed House Joint Resolution 144, which had been unanimously reported from the House Committee on Agriculture. The bill deals with marketing quotas for burley and flue-cured tobacco. Because of the effort to stimulate food production, and the possibility that that might interfere with the acreage of this tobacco, the tobacco growers and the Department of Agriculture have recommended that the joint resolution be passed. It simply would extend the marketing quota provisions of the present law to apply to the 1944-45 crop. While I am not a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the chairman of that committee, has authorized me in his name to report the joint resolution to the Senate and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say to the Senator from Kentucky that the joint resolution has not yet been received from the House.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was informed by a Member of the House that the joint resolution had been received by the Senate. I will withdraw my request.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I wish to say that of course I shall not object to the unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from Kentucky, but I think it is thoroughly bad legislative practice in the closing hours or days of a session to reach into the calendar and ask unanimous consent for consideration of bills on the calendar.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I desire to ask the Senator from Kentucky whether it is contemplated that there will be a further call of the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is. Of course, some of the measures which have been called up by unanimous consent have involved continuations of existing laws about to expire. In such cases the measures present an emergency situation. Perhaps some of the measures which have been called up today do not come within that category. I contemplate that the Senate will have a call of the calendar before a recess is taken.

Mr. WHITE. I am glad to have that assurance; because while emergencies may justify reaching into the calendar and picking out measures here and there, I think it is much better for all Members of the Senate for measures to be reached on the calendar, rather than in a fashion as to which Members are not advised.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree with the Senator, and join in his observation, in a general way; but, of course, we all understand that when we are approaching what we hope will be the tail end of the session, prior to a recess, if and when we have one, such situations do arise. It is not uncommon for requests of that sort to be made.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, let me ask what the legislative plan is for the remainder of the day?

Mr. BARKLEY. The legislative plan for the remainder of the day is to recess until tomorrow as soon as possible. I think that will be done shortly. However, to be perfectly frank, some nominations are on the way to the Senate, and we anticipate they will reach the Senate in a few minutes. Following consideration of the nominations, we hope to have the Senate take a recess until tomorrow.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. The distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky, just used the illustration that the Senate was approaching the tail end of the session. Let me point out that when one approaches the tail end, it generally is the part of wisdom to proceed with caution. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator's observation might bring on a considerable amount of conversation in which I do not wish to indulge. [Laughter.]

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I think we should have a general idea, if the majority leader is able to give it to us, as to approximately how long it is anticipated the Senate will be in session before the recess is taken.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator mean today?

Mr. MALONEY. No; I mean before the Senate takes a summer recess or adjournment.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I stated at the beginning of the week, I have entertained the hope, and it has been generally believed, that we could conclude our labors on necessary legislation and take a recess by Saturday. It is not now quite so certain that we shall be able to do that, although it is still possible. There are certain hangnails of legislation, if I may use the expression, which may not be entirely taken care of or concluded by Saturday night. Monday will be a holiday. I want to confer with the Members of the Senate as to whether they desire to have a session of the Senate on Monday. The Fourth of July falls on Sunday. Whenever that occurs, the celebration of the Fourth of July usually is had on Monday. I do not know how many Members of the Senate desire to be away, to deliver Fourth of July speeches. Personally, I see no reason why the Senate should not be in session on Monday, if there is necessary business to be transacted. It is not certain that we shall be able to conclude the session by Saturday night, although I hope it will be possible to do so; but, at the latest, it should be possible to conclude the session by next week, if it is necessary to go over until next week.

Mr. MALONEY. Is it certain that there will be a session of the Senate on Saturday?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think so.

ADJUSTMENT OF PAY STATUS OF CERTAIN WARRANT OFFICERS

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I desire to call up a bill which has been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs. It is rather urgent that the bill be passed. Its consideration will take only a brief time.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not know what the bill is. I am sure the Senate will consider the Senator's request.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I refer to House bill 2349, calendar number 376, a bill dealing with the adjustment of the pay status of warrant officers temporarily commissioned in the Army of the United States.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I shall object to consideration of any bills on the calendar by unanimous consent unless we can be given definite assurance that the measures in question are of an emergency character.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am advised that the bill I refer to is of such character. There are pending several cases of warrant officers who, having been temporarily commissioned, are drawing half pay, less pay than they were receiving prior to their promotion. The sole purpose of the bill is to provide that when such persons are promoted in grade they shall not be demoted in pay.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, is there any reason why the bill cannot be considered on the call of the calendar?

Mr. REVERCOMB. None, except that early passage of the bill is urged by the War Department because of the unfair treatment of such men who have been promoted.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I may say it is not necessary to ask unanimous consent that a bill on the calendar be taken up. It is in order to move to do so. If that is done, no objection can be raised. Senators objecting to consideration of the bill could merely vote "no" on the motion to take up the bill.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2349.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2349) to adjust the pay status of warrant officers temporarily commissioned in the Army of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia that the Senate proceed to consider the bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2349) to adjust the pay status of warrant officers temporarily commissioned in the Army of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate, and is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me say for the information of the Senate, in order that we may avoid any confusion in connection with the efforts of Senators to have the Senate take up worthy and meritorious bills, that it is entirely possible that tomorrow a situation may develop so that we can have a call of the calendar; or, if not tomorrow, certainly on Saturday. Unless a measure presents a situation involving the expiration of a law, I hope Senators will await the call of the calendar for further consideration of measures.

INVESTIGATION OF BOARD OF ECONOMIC WARFARE AND RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, some time during the last few days we have observed an unusual occurrence in Washington, in that the Vice President of the United States, who is Chairman of the Board of Economic Warfare, and the Secretary of Commerce, who is the head of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and of various subsidiary companies or corporations, have made charges and countercharges against each other regarding accumulation of strategic war materials. They have indicated a desire to have a congressional investigation of those very serious charges which concern the successful conduct of the war.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Is it not true that one of the principal topics of contention has been the supply of quinine for the American boys who are fighting in the Tropics?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is true.

Mr. LODGE. Is it not further true that there has been a very long and seri-

ous delay in obtaining quinine, and that that has delayed military operations in the Tropics and endangered the health of our soldiers?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is certainly true. It is further true that the accumulation of a great many strategic war materials needed for the prosecution of the war was authorized by Congress as far back as 1939, have been held up and the delay costly to the whole war effort. These charges are serious. These delays have been costly. They have a very serious effect on the future conduct of the war, as well as the past conduct of the war. I am therefore out of order sending to the desk a resolution calling for a senatorial investigation of this situation, and I ask for its appropriate reference and immediate action.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am glad the Senator from New Hampshire admits that it is out of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

Mr. BRIDGES subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask that the resolution which I submitted be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, that is not the committee to which it should go. It should go to the committee which has been dealing with this subject, the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. BRIDGES. It has to do with the conduct of the war and the occultation of strategic war materials.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. So does the legislation under which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Bureau of Economic Warfare have been acting. That legislation has all been sponsored by the Committee on Banking and Currency, and that is the committee to which the Senator's resolution should go.

Mr. BRIDGES. Regardless of whether it has to do with the conduct of the war?

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course. All sorts of legislation having to do with the conduct of the war has been sponsored by various committees of the Senate besides the Committee on Military Affairs. The whole subject of this controversy has arisen under legislation sponsored by the Committee on Banking and Currency. That is the committee to which the Senator's resolution should go.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The resolution (S. Res. 165) submitted by Mr. BRIDGES was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the operations and activities of the Board of Economic Warfare, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and the various corporations created or organized pursuant to section 5d of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, relating to the buying, selling, storage, and use of commodities defined by the President as strategic or critical materials pursuant to such section 5d, and to report to the Senate

at the earliest practicable date, the results of such investigation, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

For the purpose of this investigation, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$7,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the message from the President in regard to an executive nomination having reached the Senate and having been received at the desk, I presume that it will be laid before the Senate when we go into executive session.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS AND COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION TO SUBMIT REPORTS

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight to submit reports from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and the Committee on Immigration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFarland in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations (and withdrawing two nominations), which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received and nominations withdrawn, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CHANDLER, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Sundry officers for promotion and/or appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army.
By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:
Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Navy nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

THE ARMY

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, sundry routine nominations in the Army were reported earlier in the day. I ask unanimous consent for their present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the junior Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed.

MAJ. GEN. MILLER GRIEVE WHITE

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, the President of the United States has sent to the Senate the nomination of Brig. Gen. Miller Grieve White to be major general. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the nomination. I have consulted with the majority and minority leaders, and I understand that there is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I cannot let this confirmation pass without saying a word in behalf of Brigadier General White—now major general. He has been doing one of the finest jobs in the Army, and I am very happy to see him promoted to the rank of major general.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the Army nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 49 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, July 2, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 1 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Ray Atherton, of Illinois, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of

the United States of America to Canada; also to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Denmark and as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America near the Government of Luxemburg now established in Canada.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

George Henry Payne, of New York, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of 7 years from July 1, 1943 (reappointment).

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE MAJOR GENERALS

Brig. Gen. Miller Grieve White (lieutenant colonel, Infantry, National Guard of the United States), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Louis Emerson Hibbs (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. John Ernest Dahlquist (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Ray Wehnes Barker (colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Thomas Guerdon Hearn (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Raymond Godfrey Lehman (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Lester Thomas Miller (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Thomas James Hanley, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Charles Egbert Branshaw (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERALS

Col. Frederick Mixon Harris (major, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Edward John McGaw (major, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Robert Nicholas Young (major, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. William Edward Raab Covell (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army), Army of the United States.

Col. Thomas Edward Lewis (major, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Peter Powell Rodes (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. William Henry Tunner (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Casper Ball Rucker, Infantry.

Col. Harold Arthur Bartron (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. George Hendricks Beverley (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Paul Boyle Kelly (lieutenant colonel, Coast Artillery Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Walter Raymond Peck (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Percy James Carroll, Medical Corps.

Col. Dabney Otey Elliott, Corps of Engineers.

Col. Oliver Boone Bucher (lieutenant colonel, Coast Artillery Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Alfred Warrington Marriner (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Hobart Raymond Gay (lieutenant colonel, Quartermaster Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Robert Bruce McBride, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Robert William Crichlow, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Coast Artillery Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Clarence Peyton Kane (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Edward Harrison Alexander (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Clyde Lloyd Hyssong (lieutenant colonel, Adjutant General's Department), Army of the United States.

Col. Kenneth George Althaus (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Lester Amiel Daugherty (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Frank August Helleman (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Col. Richard Emmel Nugent (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Cortlandt Van Rensselaer Schuyler (major, Coast Artillery Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. John Leonard Pierce (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Myron Ray Wood (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Henning Linden (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Joseph Edward Baston, Medical Corps. Col. Edward Wrenne Timberlake (lieutenant colonel, Coast Artillery Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Byron Elihu Gates (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. William Pinckney Bledsoe (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Philip Hayes, Field Artillery.

Col. Ross Gordon Hoyt (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Frank Lewis Culin, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. George Francis Schulgen (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Walter Alexander Dumas (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Frank Seymoure Ross (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Roger Maxwell Ramey (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States), Army of the United States, Air Corps.

Col. Hugh Johnston Knerr (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Ned Schramm (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. John Caraway Arrowsmith (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Col. Earl Seeley Hoag (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

TO BE MAJOR GENERAL

Brig. Gen. William Henry Harrison, Army of the United States.

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERAL

Col. Albert Jesse Browning, Army of the United States.

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERAL

Col. Julius Cecil Holmes (major, Military Intelligence Reserve), Army of the United States.

IN THE NAVY

Medical Director Edward U. Reed to be a medical director in the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for temporary service, while serving as district medical officer, Third Naval District, to rank from the 25th day of June 1943.

Medical Director George C. Thomas to be a medical director in the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for temporary service, while serving as district medical officer, Eleventh Naval District, to rank from the 25th day of June 1943.

Medical Director William L. Mann, Jr., to be a medical director in the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for temporary service, while serving as district medical officer, Thirteenth Naval District, to rank from the 25th day of June 1943.

Medical Director Joseph J. A. McMullin to be a medical director in the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for temporary service, while serving as district medical officer, Fifth Naval District, to rank from the 25th day of June 1943.

Medical Director Richard H. Laning to be a medical director in the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for temporary service, while serving as district medical officer, First Naval District, to rank from the 25th day of June 1943.

Medical Director Danield Hunt to be a medical director in the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for temporary service, while serving as district medical officer, Twelfth Naval District, to rank from the 25th day of June 1943.

Pay Director Frank Baldwin to be a pay director in the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for temporary service, while serving as Director of the Naval Cost Inspection Service, to rank from the 25th day of June 1943.

Pay Director Everett G. Morsell to be a pay director in the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for temporary service, while serving as district supply officer, Ninth Naval District, to rank from the 25th day of June 1943.

Pay Director Arthur H. Mayo to be a pay director in the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for temporary service, while serving as supply officer in command, Naval Supply Depot, Oakland, Calif., to rank from the 25th day of June 1943.

Pay Director John J. Gaffney to be a pay director in the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral for temporary service, while serving as district supply officer, Fourteenth Naval District, and with additional duties as supply officer in command, Naval Supply Depot, Pearl Harbor, and supply officer, Navy Yard, Pearl Harbor, to rank from the 25th day of June 1943.

Pay Director Malcolm G. Sarrow to be a pay director in the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for temporary service, while serving as supply officer in command, Naval Supply Depot, Norfolk, Va., to rank from the 1st day of July 1943.

Civil Engineer Henry F. Bruns to be a civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for temporary service, while serving as superintending civil engineer of Area VI and Area VII, to rank from the 25th day of June 1943.

Civil Engineer James T. Mathews to be a civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for temporary service, while serving as superintending civil engineer of Area IV, to rank from the 25th day of June 1943.

Civil Engineer John J. Manning to be a civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for temporary service, while serving as director, Atlantic Division, Bureau of Yards and Docks, to rank from the 25th day of June 1943.

Civil Engineer Carl H. Cotter to be a civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for temporary service, while serving as director, Pacific Division, Bureau of Yards

and Docks, to rank from the 25th day of June 1943.

WITHDRAWALS

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate July 1 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

FOREIGN SERVICE

Ray Atherton, of Illinois, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Denmark, now assigned as Acting Chief of the Division of European Affairs in the Department of State, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Canada; also to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America near the Government of Luxemburg now established in Canada.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

George Henry Payne, member of the Federal Communications Commission.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 1 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

IN THE ARMY

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be major general

Miller Grieve White

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Lt. Col. Don Elwood Lowry et al.

(NOTE.—A list of the names of all persons whose nominations for promotion or appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army were confirmed today, may be found in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 29, 1943, under the caption "Nominations" beginning with the name of Don Elwood Lowry on p. 6740 and ending with the name of Guy Wycoff Harlow on p. 6745.)

IN THE NAVY

PROMOTIONS

To be captains

Francis T. Spellman

Charles D. Lefler

To be commanders

Alan R. McCracken Burton Davis

George L. Menocal Robert M. Morris

To be lieutenants

Rufus L. Taylor Harry A. Barnard, Jr.

Roger M. Keithly Charles M. Holcombe

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Eli B. Roth William G. Kornahrens

Robert C. Barnes Charles Holovak

Clarence W. Becker David G. Bryce

To be surgeons

Arthur W. Eaton, Jr.

Stephen E. Flynn

To be passed assistant surgeons

Howell E. Wiggins Robert O. Canada, Jr.

Robert B. Greenman Vernon E. Martens

William F. Queen

To be dental surgeon, with rank of lieutenant commander

James H. Connelly

To be passed assistant dental surgeon, with the rank of lieutenant

Edward V. Barth

To be ensigns

Richard J. Kroth

Jonathan J. Crowder

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Franklin M. Haines, Jr.

William F. Eabcock

To be assistant civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade)

Chester J. Kurzawa

To be assistant paymaster, with the rank of of ensign

Louis N. Saunders, Jr.

Robert R. Wooding

To be assistant paymaster, with the rank of ensign

John F. Tynan, SC-V (G)

POSTMASTERS

MASSACHUSETTS

Dorothy M. Armstrong, Hull.

MISSOURI

Kenneth C. Patton, Clarksville.

Alfred M. Pondrom, Florissant.

VIRGINIA

Edward C. Oslin, Boydton.

Elsie P. Jones, Urbanna.

WEST VIRGINIA

Stella M. Gordon, Bramwell.

Harry C. Loudon, Fairmont.

Paul D. Young, Omar.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JULY 1, 1943

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our God, Thou art very great. Thou art clothed with honor and majesty. Thou coverest Thyself with light as with a garment. Thou stretchest out the heavens like a curtain. Thou layest the beams of Thy chambers in the waters. Thou makest the clouds Thy chariots and walkest upon the wings of the wind. O Lord, how manifold are Thy works; in wisdom Thou hast made them all; the earth is full of Thy riches.

Heavenly Father, every day's dawn awakens the echo of Thy merciful providence—a miracle of Thy great love, so gloriously and impartially given. We pray that we may lay hold of this truth and hide it away in our hearts. Direct us to hallow all our days with a reverent recognition of Thee as our Creator, and may we love to call Thee "our Father." We beseech Thee ever to inspire us with the faith that springs like the eagle soaring to meet the sun and praying exultingly unto Thee: "O Lord, Thy will be done." Give us the spirit that enables us to walk our ways in contentment and peace. Make sorrow a stranger to all our firesides and let Thy love radiate in all our homes, and unto Thee shall be the praise both now and ever. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 33. Concurrent resolution relating to the enrollment of H. R. 2869.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following

title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1130. An act to provide for the care of children of mothers employed in war areas in the United States, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2968. An act making appropriations for war agencies in the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing vote of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. HOLMAN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate further insists upon its amendments numbered 5, 60, and 61 to the bill (H. R. 2714) entitled "An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House of Representatives, and agrees to a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, Mr. LODGE to be conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2869. An act to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes, and

H. R. 2996. An act making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

THE MEAT SHORTAGE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, the continued bungling of the O. P. A. regarding the meat situation in the United States is growing worse hourly. I bring this to your attention again this morning for the simple reason that in some areas the people are not receiving meat even though they have points entitling them to buy it. Cattle are being taken from the fattening pens and placed back on the ranges. This certainly seems to be a shame when we have more meat animals today in the United States than at any time in the history of our Na-

tion. We are killing one of the best businesses the country has ever had all because some people down here in O. P. A. who know nothing whatsoever about it set up rules and regulations that strangle it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit two unanimous consent requests: First, to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a letter from Hon. Gordon H. Turner, an official of the National Youth Administration in Nashville, together with a report by Dr. S. L. Smith, Chairman of the Tennessee National Youth Administration Advisory Committee, for the fiscal year just closing.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and by request to include a short summary of peace proposals submitted to me by a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a radio address made by Edward R. Murrow over the Columbia Broadcasting System from Philadelphia on June 20, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE MEAT SHORTAGE IN NEW YORK

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have called attention frequently to the shortage of meat in New York City and the situation this morning I will say is getting worse. People stand in line for hours to get a lamb chop. Steaks are out of the question. Roast beef is beyond the pay range of anybody in New York unless he has ample economic security; yet the New York Times this morning again repeats the statement that there is a vast surplus of cattle, and a Mr. Montague, general counsel for the United States Southwestern Cattle Growers, says that there is a surplus of 15,000,000 head of cattle in the West. What are you going to do to help get this beef to New York? We have been struggling with this question for some time.

There must be some solution found even if it means the seizing of some of these cattle. The War Food Administration seized corn in western elevators, the time

may have arrived for drastic action by way of seizure of cattle to get meat to industrial areas. The War Powers Acts give ample authority. The price paid maybe will be the standard price set by the Department of Agriculture or the War Food Administration. The growers and farmers should have no losses, but that meat should be gotten to the East.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

PAY-AS-YOU-GO TAXATION

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, although the House may little note it should long remember July 1, 1943. Today marks the inauguration of a great change in the affairs of the American people. It is the day that marks the beginning of a pay-as-you-earn tax collection system. I believe it is safe to state that this day marks the beginning of the end of retroactive personal income taxation. It is the day on which the employers of the United States begin to withhold at the source taxes on the income of about 40,000,000 persons.

While the Congress did not approve of my original proposal to move the tax clock ahead 1 year without any doubling up of taxes, it did make the greatest change and improvement in our personal income tax law since its enactment in 1913.

I only want to take advantage of the occasion to say a few words which might fall under the heading of "unfinished business" as far as pay-as-you-go taxation is concerned. I am prompted to do this because I know that the final terms of that legislation came to rest rather heavily and somewhat unfairly on some taxpayers and employers. I therefore want to assure all those who may feel they have been unjustly dealt with that pay-as-you-go legislation is not regarded by some as complete, perfect, or finished. As it stands it is merely the best that could be done under difficult circumstances. Therefore, so far as I can do so I shall make every effort to prepare and enact legislation that will remove any inequities which may be demonstrated. Whenever new revenue legislation is again taken up in which changes of that kind properly may be included I shall do all I can to that end.

NATIONAL WAR AGENCIES

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 2968, the national war agencies bill, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection, and the Speaker appointed the following conferees on the part of the House: Messrs. CANNON of Missouri, WOODRUM of Vir-

ginia, LUDLOW, SNYDER, O'NEAL, RABAUT, JOHNSON of Oklahoma, TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, LAMBERTSON, and DITTER.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial appearing in the Washington News of June 29.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include the report of a meeting of farmers living in Howard County, Mo.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SCHWABE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution from the farmers of Wayne County, Ohio.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CARSON]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. O'NEAL asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

AMENDMENT TO CIVIL SERVICE ACT CONCERNING THOSE INDUCTED OR ENLISTED IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill which I regard to be of very considerable importance to those who have left their civilian occupations and who are now enlisted in the armed forces of the United States.

This bill provides protection for all those who, while they are enjoying civil service eligibility, are inducted or enlisted in the armed forces, by suspending permanent appointments to civil-service positions for the duration and a short period thereafter. While the bill does not in any way infringe upon appointments under war-service regulations, it gives the service man or woman the opportunity to avail themselves of a previously acquired civil service status at the end of the war.

The bill also provides that no period of time served subsequent to May 1, 1940, shall be counted in determining the period of eligibility for appointment under the civil-service laws if such person's name appeared on an eligible register or on a reemployment or replacement list of the Civil Service Commission at the time he entered active military or naval service or if he attained eligibility during such service.

Since this bill affords a substantial measure of protection to those in the armed forces of our country, I am sure

it will be given very careful consideration by the committee and ultimately by the House.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler] in reference to the meat situation that there are many representatives from rural areas that would appreciate very much if he would join in remedying this meat situation. It so happens that before there was interference in Washington meat flowed to New York in plentiful quantities. The trouble is not with the farmer. That is not the place that we need any drastic action on the part of the Government. The action that must be taken is right here in Washington, to stop bureaus, principally the O. P. A., from destroying food and interfering with its processing and distribution.

The gentleman should help us enact H. R. 2837, which would place the entire food situation under one head. This bill is the outgrowth of the farsighted efforts of our minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., in creating the Republican study committee on food.

GOVERNMENT ARSENALS

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mr. CLASON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

MARKETING OF BURLEY AND FLUE-CURED TOBACCO

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 144) relating to the marketing of burley and flue-cured tobacco under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the resolution?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. The object of the joint resolution is to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to declare quotas on burley and flue-cured tobacco for the crop year 1944. Under the present law, it is necessary for the Secretary of Agriculture before he can declare quotas to make certain determinations. Due to the uncertainty of our export trade in tobacco and our labor situation, it is purely a guess with the Secretary, and he does not know whether he will be able to make the determination with any degree of accuracy. We are anxious to see that the quotas are retained for the crop year 1944. This resolution would give the Secretary of Agriculture the right to declare quotas for the crop year 1944. In no other respect is the present tobacco law changed.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. We do not want to have the growers of tobacco subjected to the uncertainty that might grow out of the conditions with which we are confronted, and this measure simply freezes the industry as it now is.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. That is the object of the bill.

Mr. JENNINGS. It lets the farmers go ahead on the present basis.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. It gives the Secretary the right to declare quotas for the crop year 1944. Then the program would have to be submitted to the growers under a referendum and two-thirds would have to approve it.

Mr. JENNINGS. This measure has the unanimous approval of the representatives from the tobacco-growing sections of the country?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Yes.

Mr. JENNINGS. It does not mean alone the production of tobacco, it means also the production of foodstuffs, because it enables the grower of tobacco who also grows foodstuffs to keep his labor on the farm.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. That is right.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. May I make the observation that the committee felt when this matter was presented yesterday morning—and it was fully and completely presented—that the legislation would assist in promoting the food program because it was very clearly demonstrated that if the labor were taken off the tobacco production now there would be an expansion in tobacco production and acreage would be devoted to it which would otherwise be devoted to the production of food.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. That is correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I call attention at this time to the fact that we have heard a lot about the most-favored nations, and now we are hearing about our most-favored crops. In

addition to what has been said, I should like to point out this. What has been said about the bill is of course true. What we are doing is allowing the people who raise tobacco to decide for themselves, by a two-thirds vote, whether they want to increase the acreage or do not want to increase it.

I should also like to call your attention to the fact that although tobacco is bringing 195 percent of parity at the present time, our tobacco friends the other day were pretty anxious to roll back the price of butter when the matter of roll-back was under consideration, and that this crop, a minor crop in the United States, is getting legislative advantages and has the sources of the United States Treasury to help them hold it up there at the same time that a big product like butter has to be subjected to all these whims of the New Deal.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. Permit me to say to my good friend from Wisconsin, who always has an eagle eye peeled for the defense of butter, that I am from a dairying section, and the tobacco-producing section of the country has more milch cows than any other section except Wisconsin and Iowa.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And Michigan.

Mr. JENNINGS. I include Michigan—I am always for the dairy industry—east Tennessee is a great dairy section.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

*Resolved, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 312 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to the finding of the total supply of tobacco, the reserve supply level and the amount of the national marketing quota, and the provisions of section 313 of said act relating to the apportionment of the national marketing quota for tobacco among the States and farms, national marketing quotas for burley and flue-cured tobacco for the marketing year 1944-45 shall be proclaimed and the national marketing quotas and State and farm acreage allotments shall be the same as for the preceding year: *Provided, however,* That an additional acreage not in excess of 2 percent of the total acreage allotted to all farms in each State in 1940 shall be allotted in accordance with the applicable provisions of subsection (a) of section 313 and an additional acreage equal to not more than 5 percent of the national marketing quota shall be allotted to farms on which no tobacco was produced in the last 5 years in accordance with the provisions of subsection (g) of section 313. This joint resolution shall not have the effect of modifying or repealing any other provision of said act.*

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, informed the House that on the following dates the President ap-

proved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On June 26, 1943:

H. R. 1762. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2427. An act to amend section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended;

H. R. 2556. An act for relief of Burton S. Radford; and

H. R. 2713. An act making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and additional appropriations therefor for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

On June 28, 1943:

H. R. 2409. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2612. An act to extend the effective date of the act of December 17, 1941, relating to additional safeguards to the radio communications service of ships of the United States; and

H. R. 338. An act to authorize the incorporated city of Anchorage, Alaska, to purchase and improve the electric light and power system of the Anchorage Light & Power Co., Inc., an Alaska corporation, and for such purpose to issue bonds in the sum of not to exceed \$1,250,000 in excess of present statutory debt limits.

On June 29, 1943:

H. J. Res. 131. Joint resolution giving the consent of the Congress to an agreement between the State of Indiana and the Commonwealth of Kentucky establishing a boundary between said State and said Commonwealth;

H. R. 2292. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the use of the American National Red Cross in aid of the land and naval forces in time of actual or threatened war";

H. R. 1642. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2520. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to facilitate the construction, extension, or completion of interstate petroleum pipe lines related to national defense, and to promote interstate commerce," approved July 30, 1941.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 120]

Baldwin, Md.	Fitzpatrick	Johnson,
Baldwin, N. Y.	Ford	Ward
Barden	Fulmer	Kilburn
Bonner	Furlong	King
Bradley, Mich.	Gallagher	Lea
Buckley	Gifford	Lesinski
Burdick	Green	Magnuson
Byrne	Hall	Mansfield,
Capozzoli	Edwin Arthur	Tex.
Cochran	Hall	Merritt
Costello	Leonard W.	Morrison, N. C.
Culkin	Hancock	Nichols
Cunningham	Hartley	Norton
Curley	Hébert	O'Hara
Dawson	Hollfield	O'Leary
Ellsworth	Izac	Phillips
Fay	Johnson,	Plumley
Fish	J. Leroy	Robison, Ky.

Russell	Smith, Va.	Van Zandt
Shafer	Taylor	Vinson, Ga.
Sheppard	Tolan	West
Sheridan	Treadway	

The SPEAKER. On this call 369 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including a statement issued by Judge Marvin Jones, immediately following his induction into office as Food Administrator.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including a letter from Mr. Biggers, respecting certain remarks of the President of the United States, together with excerpts from the Land O' Lakes News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include two articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report upon the bill (H. R. 2935) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina calls up a conference report upon the Labor-Federal Security Administration bill and asks unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2935) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 12, 15, and 29.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, 18, 20, 21, and 22, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amend-

ment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$225,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$330,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment with the following proviso inserted at the end thereof: "Provided further, That the foregoing proviso shall not be so construed as to prevent any patient from having the services of any practitioner of her own choice, paid for out of this fund, so long as States laws are complied with"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$4,400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$595,340"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "Provided, That this program shall end June 30, 1944"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$35,328,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"None of the moneys appropriated by this Act to the Social Security Board or to the Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor for grants in aid of State agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost of operation of said agencies, including the salaries and expenses of officers and employees of said agencies, shall be withheld from the said agencies of any States which have established by legislative enactment and have in operation a merit system and classification and compensation plan covering the selection, tenure in office, and compensation of their employees, because of any disapproval of their personnel or the manner of their selection by the agencies of the said States, or the rates of pay of said officers or employees."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$11,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$475,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree

to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$2,098,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$47,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 19, 24, and 30.

BUTLER B. HARE,
M. C. TARVER,
ALBERT THOMAS,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,

Managers on the part of the House.

PAT MCCARRAN,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
J. H. BANKHEAD,
M. C. TARVER,
WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2935) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Department of Labor

Amendment No. 1, salaries: Appropriates \$386,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$352,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 2, salaries and expenses, Working Conditions Service, Division of Labor Standards (national defense): Eliminates language and appropriation of \$700,000 inserted by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3, salaries and expenses, child labor provisions, Fair Labor Standards Act: Appropriates \$225,000, instead of \$200,000 as proposed by the House and \$253,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4, salaries and expenses, maternal and child welfare: Appropriates \$360,000, instead of \$350,000 as proposed by the House and \$378,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 5: Restores language, proposed to be stricken out, inhibiting regulations discriminating between persons licensed under State law to practice obstetrics amended by adding a proviso to prevent restriction on the free choice by patients of the type of practitioner desired.

Amendment No. 6, grants to States for emergency maternity and infant care (national defense): Appropriates \$4,400,000, instead of \$4,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$4,800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Federal Security Agency

Amendment No. 7, Food and Drug Administration enforcement operations: Appropriates \$2,323,580 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,200,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 8: Appropriates \$94,400 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$90,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 9, salaries, Howard University: Appropriates \$595,340, instead of \$591,240 as proposed by the House and \$597,840 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10: Changes language in paragraph making appropriations for loans to students to provide that such loans shall be made only to those persons who received loans during the fiscal year 1943.

Amendment No. 11: Provides that the student-loan program shall not continue beyond June 30, 1944, and eliminates a provision, proposed by the Senate, restricting the number of beneficiaries to 2,000.

Amendment No. 12: Provides for supervision of the Office of Education defense-training program by the Federal Security Administrator as proposed by the House instead of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 13: Restricts application of provision requiring sale of slides and films to slides and films hereafter made.

Amendment No. 14: Provides \$45,000,000 for training of nurses as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$3,500,000 as proposed by the House and includes language to carry into effect Public Law 74, Seventy-eighth Congress, the so-called Bolton bill.

Amendment No. 15: Provides for payment in advance by the District of Columbia of amounts due St. Elizabeths Hospital as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 16, grants to States for unemployment compensation administration: Appropriates \$35,328,000, instead of \$30,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$37,328,502 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 17: Restores a limitation proposed by the House to prevent interference by Federal agencies with the operation of State merit systems for appointment of personnel.

National Labor Relations Board

Amendment No. 18, salaries: Appropriates \$1,715,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,415,000 as proposed by the House.

Railroad Retirement Board

Amendment No. 20: Eliminates a restriction, proposed by the House, on the amount which might be paid to any person serving as referee during any one year.

Amendment No. 21, salaries: Appropriates \$2,030,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,706,769 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 22, miscellaneous expenses: Appropriates \$490,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$450,000 as proposed by the House.

War Manpower Commission

Amendment No. 23, general administration: Appropriates \$11,000,000, instead of \$9,994,800 as proposed by the House and \$12,177,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 25, apprentice training service: Appropriates \$475,500, instead of \$465,500 as proposed by the House and \$500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26, apprentice training service (national defense): Appropriates \$600,000, instead of \$550,000 as proposed by the House and \$650,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 27, travel expenses, Employment Office Facilities and Services: Allocates \$2,093,000, instead of \$1,980,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,275,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 28: Appropriates \$47,500,000, instead of \$45,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$50,500,000 as proposed by the Senate for Employment Office facilities and services.

Amendment No. 29: Restores a provision, proposed by the House, requiring the maintenance of State salary scales in the employment service during the period of Federal operation.

Amendments in disagreement

The following amendments are reported in disagreement. As to each of such amendments the motion authorized to be made by action of the managers on the part of the House is stated:

Amendment No. 19: Strikes from the bill a provision, inserted by the House, prohibiting the use of the funds of the National Labor Relations Board in any case involving an agreement between management and labor which has been in force more than 3 months. A motion will be made to recede from disagreement and concur in the amendment with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter proposed to be stricken out and add at the end thereof the following:

"Provided, That, hereafter, notice of such agreement shall have been posted in the plant affected for said period of three months, said notice containing information as to the location at an accessible place of such agreement where said agreement shall be open for inspection by any interested person."

Amendment No. 24: Requires confirmation by the Senate of all persons appointed to positions the salaries of which are paid out of the appropriation for General Administration of the War Manpower Commission and whose salaries are at the rate of \$4,500 per annum or more. The managers will move to insist on disagreement.

Amendment No. 30: Appropriates \$41,800,000 and reappropriates \$6,000,000 for the National Youth Administration and strikes out a provision, proposed by the House, for liquidation of the National Youth Administration. A motion will be made to recede from disagreement and concur in the Senate amendment.

BUTLER B. HARE,
M. C. TARTER,
ALBERT THOMAS,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The Senate in the consideration of this bill, added 30 amendments. Out of the 30 amendments, 27 were agreed to in conference, and 3 are reported in disagreement. One is with reference to the National Youth Administration, another relates to an amendment to the National Labor Relations Board appropriation which would prohibit the use of funds in any investigation where complaint is filed after the agreement entered into between the managers and employees or labor which has been in existence for 3 months of satisfactory service or unless complaint were filed within 3 months after the agreement. The third is an amendment offered in the Senate known as the McKellar amendment, which would require Senate confirmation of all appointees in the Manpower Commission drawing salaries of \$4,500 a year or more.

One amendment of the Senate agreed to by House conferees was one increasing the appropriation for training nurses. This was in response to an act passed by the House which became a law after the subcommittee and the full Committee on Appropriations had recommended appropriations for 1944. As I have suggested, it was a bill providing Federal aid to nurses, to be trained, with the understanding that they would be available

for services in the armed forces. This appropriation approximates \$45,000,000. There was no disagreement on the part of the House conferees or the Senate conferees on this item.

Some discussion arose over the amendment passed by the House originally that would prevent discrimination on the part of the Children's Bureau in selecting physicians or persons to officiate at the birth of the children of servicemen. It will be recalled that a few weeks ago the Congress provided that Federal aid should be given to all wives and children of servicemen at the time of the births of such children.

In other words Congress provided that the Federal Government would provide medical care and hospitalization for expectant mothers, who are wives of servicemen.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes. The bill as it passed the House carried a provision which prevented discrimination in the selection of persons to officiate at the birth of such children. In other words, the bill provided that any person licensed under a State law to practice obstetrics should be available if requested by the prospective mother to officiate at the birth of her child. There was some difference of opinion as to the wisdom of this provision in the House bill, but it was passed without objection. The committee submitted this proposal upon the theory that if a State has enacted legislation providing the qualifications of persons to officiate at childbirth or to practice obstetrics, then it is not within the province of the Federal Government to nullify the acts of the States and arrogate to itself the right to determine who shall officiate at the birth of a child. Therefore that amendment was inserted to prevent discrimination by the Children's Bureau. The conferees have agreed upon this amendment, and it is no longer in question.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. I understand that the report now contains a provision that people have the right to choose their own physician?

Mr. HARE. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. So long as he is sanctioned by the State law in which the parents reside?

Mr. HARE. The prospective mother will have the right to select her own physician provided that physician qualifies under the law of the State.

Mrs. BOLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mrs. BOLTON. The lack of discrimination only applies to obstetrics?

Mr. HARE. Only to obstetrics.

Mrs. BOLTON. That is very clear?

Mr. HARE. Very clear and definite, because we do not want it to apply to crippled children and other functions of the Children's Bureau, but only to wives and children of servicemen.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I did not quite understand the gentleman. Will the gentleman explain to the House what discrimination exists if you adopt the Senate proposal? I understood the Senate struck out the House provision. That was the Senate amendment. Now you propose to reinsert it with this amendment. What discrimination exists if you adopt the Senate amendment?

Mr. HARE. No discrimination, because the Senate receded.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. TARVER. There is discrimination now being practiced by the Children's Bureau, which refuses in this program to allow soldiers' wives to use practitioners of certain types who are licensed by the laws of their States to practice obstetrics. The committee intended to remove that discrimination. If the Senate amendment is agreed to, the discrimination will continue.

Mr. BULWINKLE. But the Women's Bureau provides only for medical men to practice obstetrics.

Mr. HARE. No. I did not say with the Women's Bureau. We understand that the practice of the Children's Bureau is that they will not permit anyone to officiate at childbirth unless it can be shown that this particular person has a certificate or a diploma from a particular kind of college, and has been recommended to serve in this capacity.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Does not the gentleman think there ought to be some restriction?

Mr. HARE. Not if the State has first qualified the individual. I do not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman indicate whether there is any money in this provision for N. Y. A. for college assistance, or is all included in the Senate amendment for training in industrial work? My observation of N. Y. A. has been chiefly in regard to its benefits in high school and college aid during the depression.

Mr. HARE. The Senate amendment carries a provision for \$5,000,000 for student aid in colleges, very much on the same basis it was carried last year.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does that apply to high-school students?

Mr. HARE. It does not. It applies only to student aid in colleges.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I am sure most of the Members will remember that this provision was passed by the House without opportunity to discuss it, when this bill was under consideration 2 or

3 weeks ago; those in charge of the bill after having moved, and the House voted, to have 5 hours for debate, started reading the bill after 3 hours and 45 minutes, and the provision was passed before opportunity was given to discuss it before the House.

However, the Senate subcommittee wisely decided to strike out the provision forbidding the Children's Bureau to set up professional standards for those practitioners of obstetrics who could qualify to receive Federal money under this bill. That provision was stricken out in the Senate subcommittee and the amendment was agreed to unanimously by the Senate.

Now the conferees have reinserted it, and added a still further amendment, which throws the door wide open for anybody to get Federal money who can persuade a State licensing board to give him or her a license to take care of women in childbirth. If this new amendment, at the top of page 2 of the conference report read, "The foregoing proviso shall not be so construed as to prevent any patient from having the services of 'any physician' or 'any obstetrician,' of her own choice," instead of "any practitioner," we would have no difficulty. I do not believe anybody would have any objection to that.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. Yes, I yield.

Mr. TARVER. Is the gentleman of the opinion that the Federal Government under the Constitution has any power to impose its judgment upon the residents of a State as to who shall be permitted to practice medicine or obstetrics for them?

Mr. JUDD. I am strongly of the opinion that the Federal Government is under obligation to see that money that it appropriates is spent only for services of the highest standard.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman will admit that other residents of a State, other than wives of soldiers, can select any type of practitioner licensed by the laws of their State?

Mr. JUDD. That is right.

Mr. TARVER. Why should the Federal Government say that soldiers' wives cannot do that? They cannot have that privilege, but all other residents of a State may, of course, have it, under the State law.

Mr. JUDD. Other residents are paying for their services out of their own pockets. The services for these wives are being paid for by Federal money.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman desires to restrict the privileges of soldiers' wives in selecting practitioners of their own choosing, who are licensed by the laws of their State?

Mr. JUDD. Yes, I do, because in some States the laws are so loose that practically anybody can practice obstetrics.

We would not be imposing our will on the States. We would merely be saying, as we do in appropriation bills almost every week, that in order to get Federal money certain prescribed conditions must be met. Existing legislation gives the Children's Bureau the power to es-

tablish such standards. The program has produced most excellent results. Do we want to change it now, and forbid the maintaining of standards for the care of the wives and babies of our soldiers?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Where the doctors have all gone to war, and most of them have, and the community is in need of doctors, why not call on some of these practitioners licensed by the State, who meet the requirements of the State, whoever they may be, to care for the women who are about to give birth to children?

Mr. JUDD. It is interesting to note why so many of the doctors are in the Army and Navy and the so-called practitioners are still at home.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Of course, our women will not stop having babies just because the doctors are in the service, and someone other than graduate doctors must care for them while the doctors are in the service.

Mr. JUDD. I hope the gentleman does not mean that the way it sounds. Doctors are not responsible for women having babies. They merely deliver them.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; I mean it. They cannot wait until the doctors return from the war before they have babies.

Mr. JUDD. Civilian doctors are reduced in number and the other practitioners are at home because the Army and Navy takes the former into their Medical Corps and will not take the latter for the care of the men, that is one of the principal reasons why I believe we should not do less for their wives, at least not in a program supported by the Federal Government. The question is, Are we willing to vote these funds without some restrictions on their use?

Mr. HOFFMAN. The women are still having babies, are they not? They must have care, must they not, even if that care cannot be the best?

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, the difficulty is not with these States which have laws requiring that persons in order to practice obstetrics, have to meet the same high standards in basic sciences, clinical training, internship, and so forth, as do regular physicians. The difficulty is with the many States which do not have such laws that they do not require sufficient training or adequate standards.

To be specific with regard to one class of practitioners, the osteopaths, a few States, such as New Hampshire, Texas, Colorado, California, give unlimited licenses to practice to osteopaths. They have correspondingly high standards to protect their people.

In about 10 other States osteopaths are not forbidden to practice obstetrics, but they cannot use any drugs.

In some other States they can use some drugs, but not certain other drugs. Do we want our soldiers' wives to be placed in the care of those who cannot give them a proper drug or an anesthetic to relieve their pain or to check hemorrhage that may otherwise be fatal?

In many States osteopaths are not forbidden to practice obstetrics but are forbidden to perform any surgical operations, or any but minor operations.

As the Members of the House know, there are many obstetrical cases in which serious lacerations result and if repair is made immediately the mother will recover; otherwise she may die, or may have anatomical and functional abnormalities that are permanently disabling or require serious operations later.

The gentleman from South Carolina said he had no objection to allowing other practitioners than physicians to practice obstetrics under this program; but would not extend the privilege beyond the practice of obstetrics. If it is proper to let down the bars for the care of women in such a crisis as childbirth, just why should we maintain higher standards for the care of children, normal or crippled? Or is that contemplated after this provision today serves as an entering wedge? In all or practically all of the States, osteopaths are licensed to practice manipulation; the treatment of bone, joint, and muscle conditions is the field in which they usually regard themselves as specialists. How long is the Children's Bureau to be allowed to hold to present standards for the care of crippled children?

I cannot in good conscience approve this provision which, by a rider on an appropriation bill and without full hearing and careful consideration, drastically alters the procedures we have built up over a period of many years and have followed with such excellent results for needy mothers and children.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. JUDD. I hope very much that during a war like this we will not abandon the standards that have been worked out so carefully, and especially for the care of the wives and babies of men whom we have called into military service, and for whom we are therefore responsible during the absence of their husbands.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I want to speak to you on this amendment from the standpoint of a physician with 25 years' experience, and one and one-half as State health director, in which time I had charge of the administration of the funds under the Children's Bureau, which we allocated to Nebraska.

I think we should see the picture accurately and then decide in our own minds which is the proper way to go.

As State health director of the State of Nebraska for one and a half years, I had these funds under my supervision. I want to say to the House that this amendment, if it is left in this bill, will hinder the administration of the funds in a manner which is wise.

There are many States in which individuals are permitted to take care of obstetrical cases, but where they are not permitted to perform certain acts, like the administration of hypodermics or like the repair of lacerations. It is a

question of deciding if this House wants quantity of care or quality of care for the wives of our soldiers. In the practice of surgery and in the practice of obstetrics many new things have been discovered in the last quarter of a century. There are many medicines that are being used today by men who have qualified to take care of women who are having babies that were not used a few years ago.

If you adopt this amendment it will make it impossible for the children's bureaus or the health directors in many of the States to use the funds and give these women who are going to have babies the type and quality of care you would want your daughter or your neighbor's daughter to have. This is true because the midwife, and the chiropractor in some States, take care of obstetrical cases and they will continue under this provision. You are in effect keeping future mothers from getting the quality of care they should have.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? That is a serious misstatement of fact.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I decline to yield at the moment. I said that in many States chiropractors, osteopaths, and midwives are not permitted to give hypodermic injections. They are not allowed to use any surgical procedures and many of these cases, you all realize, need that quality of care and they certainly should be entitled to it; yet under this bill you are making it impossible for them to receive that quality of care.

I now yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman indicated that chiropractors could practice in obstetrical cases. The gentleman says he is a former State health officer. I ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that there is not a single State in the United States which licenses chiropractors to practice in obstetrical cases? If the gentleman has any doubt about it I have a letter in my files that I will presently read to the House.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I believe the gentleman is right in his statement, but I do know there are many States in which they are practicing obstetrics, including Nebraska and the gentleman's own State.

Mr. KEEFE. I do not know of any chiropractor who is licensed to practice obstetrics. This proposed amendment limits the administration of the funds specifically to only those practitioners that are licensed to practice obstetrics. So the Children's Bureau would have no trouble at all.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Is the gentleman making a speech or asking a question? Let us have questions.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I should like to ask the gentleman if under the Federal Employees Compensation Act we did not set up the type of physician or practitioner who could receive funds from that act? If this bill is passed it certainly will not be in conformity with the standards of

the Federal Employees' Compensation Act.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I believe that is true.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on that issue?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Not now. I wish to make this statement: I think it not only opens the door in obstetrical cases, but it opens the door in the case of crippled children who are entitled to funds. I know some medical men who are not capable of taking care of some club feet in children. I think you are opening it up so that such cases cannot get the kind or quality of care they need. We want to be careful at this time that we do not pass a law that will make it easier for bad practices to creep in, practices we are not proud of.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. TARVER. I understood the gentleman in his reply to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] to say that he thought the action of the House should be in conformity with the rules governing the operation of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission. Is that correct?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think that hardly comes in here; the unemployment compensation law hardly enters into this picture.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman knows that the United States Employees' Compensation Act provides for the use of osteopaths, does he not? It was amended in 1940 to so provide.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It set up a standard to preclude them from taking care of many cases under the compensation act.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman still insists, however, that he is not in accord with the statement made by the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I want to say to the gentleman: That a man who is not qualified to do surgery should not do surgery and a man not qualified and with all the equipment necessary to take care of obstetrical cases should not be allowed to take care of them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has again expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I spoke on this question on June 16. I wish now to reiterate what I said at that time in general terms, that I am not unmindful of State legislation, but I think we should try to protect the health of the American people generally. This of course has been the policy of organized medicine for many years, a policy to which I wholeheartedly subscribe. The Members of this House certainly cannot forget the problems of a few years ago such as

diphtheria, typhoid fever, cholera, smallpox, and many other illnesses that were so common then but which under the skillful research of organized medicine have become so rare today.

Most of you are also aware of the great strides organized medicine and research work have made in the care of acute infections of every kind—especially pneumonia.

If you insist on this amendment it will certainly be taking a backward step and I am sure that the American people do not want that sort of thing.

I am also thinking of the men in the armed forces in which case the surgeon general agrees with organized medicine in not commissioning those who are not graduates of recognized medical schools and he says further, in backing up his views on that point:

It has recognized only that school of medicine that has its foundation on proven scientific research and practices in the healing art that are subscribed to by the vast majority of physicians throughout the world.

He further goes on to state:

The surgeon general is charged with the preservation of the physical well-being of the military forces. This responsibility cannot be discharged in the absence of fixed standards of preventive measures, diagnostic procedures, and curative therapy. These standards are found only in the school of regular medicine and are based upon scientific fact that precludes the integration of healers of schools that are founded on dogma or cult.

That in itself is reason enough for this House to take into consideration, and uphold.

In addition to the opinion of the surgeon general relative to commissioning medical men for the armed services he is also opposed to this particular legislation. The American Medical Association as well as the various States and county medical societies are also opposed to this proviso which lets down the bars and insists on the Children's Bureau of the Labor Department recognizing people who they know do not meet the qualifications of regular practitioners of medicine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, let us see if we cannot get ourselves on to a basis of thinking where we will understand the problem confronting us.

The States of this Union, with the exception of three, I believe, license osteopaths to practice obstetrics. In my State, for example, an osteopath is a member of the State examining board. In State after State they have to take the same examination to practice as does a medical practitioner, and they are licensed.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I cannot yield at this time. The gentleman did not yield until he had finished his statement. I will try to correct some of the glaring misstatements that the gentleman made in just a moment.

Mr. Speaker, State after State has osteopathic hospitals. In the city of De-

troit, for instance, is located a great osteopathic hospital that handles thousands of obstetrical cases. In the State of the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is located one of the greatest obstetricians there is in the country. I know many highly qualified osteopathic obstetricians whose services are being used daily by women who want the services of an osteopath. Bear in mind that he must be duly licensed under State law to practice obstetrics.

In view of the great shortage of practitioners that exists in the country, the attitude of the committee is that these soldiers' wives or anybody else are the ones to determine who is going to preside at the delivery of her child. We are straining at a gnat anyway, because, after all, if a wife wants to go to an osteopath, that is her business. She can do it in any State where that osteopath is licensed to practice obstetrics. She is doing it today, and she can continue to do it. The only discrimination that exists is that the wife of a soldier who employs an M. D., that M. D. gets his pay out of these Federal funds, but the wife of a soldier who has had her children delivered by an osteopath, who is qualified and licensed to practice as such, must pay out of her own pocket. You can clearly see what the discrimination is.

There has been a lot of fuzzy thinking about this situation. May I state with some certainty and definiteness that I have a letter from the National Chiropractic Association, Inc., its legislative counsel here in Washington, in which it is stated:

This is to advise you that to my knowledge the chiropractors are not licensed to practice obstetrics in any State.

That leaves out the question of neuropaths and it leaves out the question of chiropractors. We get down now to the question of midwifery. The doctors who have talked here today and who are so vigorously presenting the case of organized medicine, referred to the fact that we are going to turn these people over to the practitioners who practice midwifery.

Mr. FENTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. In just a moment. The gentleman had his opportunity.

Mr. FENTON. I had 2 minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I have in this file the State laws of every State relating to the practice of midwifery. I have examined all of them and I say without fear of contradiction that there is not a single State in this Union that licenses midwives to practice obstetrics. They have limited licenses to practice midwifery. This particular provision in the bill relates only to those individuals who are licensed to practice obstetrics by State law. That eliminates chiropractors, that eliminates midwives, that eliminates neuropaths, and any other cult of that kind. If a woman wants to employ a midwife in the State of Pennsylvania, she can do it today; and many of them do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, may I call attention to this: A statement was made by the gentleman from Nebraska in response to a question of the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee that this would throw out of harmony the Federal attitude on this question. May I call attention to the fact that Public Law Numbered 553, Seventy-fifth Congress, passed in 1940, specifically provides:

The term "physician" as described in the United States Employees' Compensation Act includes surgeons, osteopathic practitioners within the scope of their practice as defined by State law.

This is in compliance with the attitude of the Congress adopted in 1940.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does the gentleman realize that the osteopathic physicians he is speaking of are not licensed or commissioned in the Army to take care of the military men?

Mr. KEEFE. I will say this, that I think that the gentleman is perhaps correct that the Surgeon General and the medical men that have charge of that situation for the Army do not permit the commissioning of osteopaths in the Medical Corps of the Army. But I will say this: I make no great plea for osteopathy; I am only making a plea for fairness and lack of discrimination.

Mr. JUDD. Fairness to whom?

Mr. KEEFE. To the expectant mother. The mother in this case has the right to choose any person that she wants that is licensed according to the State law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. HARE. I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FENTON. I am sure the gentleman from Wisconsin wants the facts to be stated correctly.

Mr. KEEFE. Yes; I do.

Mr. FENTON. Chiropractors are licensed to practice obstetrics in certain States.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman name one?

Mr. FENTON. Also, midwives are licensed to practice in certain States.

Mr. KEEFE. All I have to say is that I have here the laws of the States. The gentleman cannot put his finger on the law of a single State in the Union or name one where chiropractors are licensed to practice obstetrics nor can he point to a single State where midwives are licensed to do anything more than midwifery, and their practice is limited to that and that alone.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. In view of the fact that the gentleman's very strong argument is based on fair play, does he believe it is fair to change the existing laws in order to give an advantage to that

class of men practicing medical arts who cannot serve in the armed forces?

Mr. KEEFE. I do not believe that is at all a fair question, because it assumes we are changing existing law. That is not the case.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Does this change in any particular any existing law? The Children's Bureau issued an arbitrary regulation.

Mr. KEEFE. It does not change any existing law in any way, shape, or manner. The only thing it does is say to the Children's Bureau, "You shall not discriminate in the matter of allocation of these funds as between those people who are licensed by State law to practice obstetrics." That is all it says.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Perhaps I can add a little light at this point.

Mr. KEEFE. Does the gentleman want to ask a question?

Mr. JUDD. I should like to know this: Does the gentleman consider that in order to be permitted to practice obstetrics under this program it must specifically state in his license that the individual is licensed to practice obstetrics? In that case there would be less objection. Confusion arises where men are licensed to practice various healing arts without specific mention of obstetrics. Unless it is expressly forbidden that he practice obstetrics, it is believed this bill would permit him to receive Federal money.

Mr. KEEFE. As far as the unanimous action of the Senate and House conferees is concerned, we consider that the person must be licensed to practice obstetrics, and that alone. That is what is provided in the pending law.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, we are discussing here a conference report on a bill involving over \$1,100,000,000. All of the time so far has been taken up with the discussion of a minor provision in the bill. It seems to me that when a subject matter of this importance is pending we ought not to allow ourselves to be sidetracked by the discussion of a minor provision which was regarded as so unimportant by the doctors in the House when the bill passed the House that they did not even offer an amendment to strike it out. Now we are asked to give all of the time in the consideration of this conference report to a discussion of the pros and cons of this doctors' fuss between doctors of a certain type and those of another type who might practice obstetrics for these soldiers' wives.

I want to direct your attention, if I can, to what I regard as one of the subject matters involved in the further consideration of this bill, which is of very much greater importance. I refer to the National Youth Administration appropriation. You will recall that when the bill was reported to the House the full committee by a majority of one, with 10 members of the full committee

absent, struck out the provision for the National Youth Administration, and the House was thereby given no opportunity to discuss the matter of whether or not it wanted to make provision for continuance of the National Youth Administration. That I think was regrettable, because I think there should be the full opportunity for every Member desiring to do so to discuss that very important subject matter.

When we come to the question of receding or not from our disagreement to the Senate amendment carrying the N. Y. A. appropriation there will be only 1 hour of debate, utilized principally by the members of the committee, and very little opportunity for that thorough discussion and consideration which would be desirable. However, I want to express the hope that the House may agree to the Senate amendment restoring the funds in this bill for the carrying on of the National Youth Administration. That is now strictly a war-training program. It is an integral part of a training-for-industry program set up under the guidance of the Bureau of Training in the War Manpower Commission, and a program which, in their judgment and in the judgment, apparently, of all of those having to do with the matter of industrial production for defense, is essential to our war effort.

It may be possible that at some time the work of the N. Y. A. should be consolidated with the work of vocational education. I am very much in favor of the appropriations which we have made heretofore and which we are carrying in this bill for vocational education. I believe that the vocational educational authorities of the States are doing a magnificent job, but there is no reason on that account at this time to abolish the National Youth Administration, which in its own field is also doing an important job, and is training for industry at the rate of 1,000 youths per day at this particular time. I know how it is in my district. Other gentlemen know how it is in their districts. We view these matters from the standpoint of what we find out in our own localities, and there may be sections of the country where administrative abuses have been carried on in this organization. It would be impossible with some far-flung organization that some administrative authorities should not exercise foolish judgment, but in my country where these work-training centers are being operated, exceedingly useful work is being done, and boys and girls are being taken out of these hills in north Georgia and given a type of training which they could not get from any available vocational-education school, or from any other source if the N. Y. A. were not available. Perhaps it could be consolidated with the work of vocational education in such a way as to function efficiently, but according to all of the evidence adduced before our subcommittee, it would require at least 6 months, if we should decide to integrate this work of the N. Y. A. with vocational education, for that to be accomplished.

In other words, we would have at least six months practically lost in this work-training program. Assuming that the training program is important to the cause of national defense, and I believe all agree that it is, certainly we ought not to stop now and try to work out somebody's plan of consolidation of the N. Y. A. with some other agency. The only effect would be to throw a monkey wrench into the machinery, which is undertaking to train for war production and I sincerely hope the House may not take that action, but may be willing to allow this program authorized by the Senate amendment to proceed.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does not the gentleman feel that the adoption of the amendment No. 5 would open up all obstetrical cases to a class of practitioners who are now denied the right to take care of their fathers in the military, and rightly so, by the Surgeon General?

Mr. TARVER. I favor the adoption of the proviso in question which the gentleman did not offer to amend when it was agreed to by the House, when the bill was under consideration in the House, and which would simply assure to the wife of a soldier the right that every other citizen of their States has, to have the type of practitioner to attend her that she may desire, provided that practitioner is licensed to practice obstetrics according to the law of that State.

Mr. Speaker, I was trying to talk about youths after they had reached a somewhat more mature stage, and I think that the idea of rejecting a conference report because of this minor provision in the bill ought to be defeated by the House, so that we may consider these other more important subject matters.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am not one who has supported many of the requests for additional funds, which have been made by a number of agencies. It has been my thought and policy that we have an obligation to restrict and carefully audit the requests which come to us from the administrative departments, but I am going to support the action of the other body in restoring to this bill the N. Y. A. appropriation, and I am doing it for one reason, and one reason only, and that is because of the fact that this is a war-training program and in my city of Philadelphia, the great United States Marine Corps Depot of Supplies has found this service to be of great help, as have many other great industries engaged in war work in the Philadelphia area.

A letter from the Marine Corps Depot of Supplies, from the commandant, states:

The local National Youth Administration undertook the fabrication of a number of items which were urgently required, and to date have produced approximately 600,000 pieces of clothing and equipment for

marine use, the manufacture of which would have cost \$35,000 if manufactured here at the depot.

The value of this service to the Marine Corps is not covered by this saving in manufacturing costs alone. The National Youth Administration facilities took over the making of several items needed only in small quantities, the production of which at this depot would have seriously interfered with the planned operation of the production lines of items required in large quantities. This particular arrangement has been of great aid, and is especially appreciated.

The quality of the work done by the National Youth Administration facilities has been highly satisfactory, and the local officials have not only expressed their willingness to cooperate in every way possible, but they have made such cooperation effective.

THE NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION

The National Youth Administration has been in existence for 7½ years. During that time it has given work and training to 4,600,000 youth. It is fair to estimate that over half of these youth are now serving our country in our armed forces or in war industries. They are more loyal citizens and more efficient workers and fighters by reason of their experience in N. Y. A.

The present important consideration, however, is what contribution is the agency now making toward the war. The N. Y. A. throughout the country is engaged in training youth for jobs in industries having war contracts. It has 39,000 work stations; that is, machines on which youth are being trained. The agency is providing war industries approximately 17,000 trained youth per month. Over 98,000 N. Y. A. youth have been trained since July 1 last. The bulk of these are trained for machine operators, welders, sheet metal and radio welders.

The cost of this training, exclusive of monthly pay, is about \$40 per month. In addition the youth are paid from \$20 to \$25 per month while in training—about 15 cents an hour.

The N. Y. A. training stations are complete production shops and the youth are engaged in producing for the armed forces and public hospitals. In Pennsylvania alone about 2,000,000 such articles have been made during the past year. These include cartridge containers for the trench bomb, parts of the bazooka bomb and other ordnance, and in the power sewing-machine shops signal flags, clothing, mattress covers, and many other articles.

The average wage paid by industry is 60 cents an hour to trainees; the average wage paid to those in the vocational schools is 55 cents an hour and ranges from 40 cents to \$1 an hour. In such cases they are not producing for the United States Government as in the case of the N. Y. A. youth. As an example, the amount paid by industry to the 2,500 persons in Philadelphia, schools alone, on a yearly basis, amounts to over double the total payment per annum to the 6,200 N. Y. A. youth currently enrolled in Pennsylvania. In the former case it amounts to \$3,120,000 per year. N. Y. A. youth have been paid since July 1, 1942, \$1,145,000, and at that rate it will amount to approximately \$1,537,000 for the year. These payments to the school trainees

are made by industry under a provision in their contract with the Government permitting up to 2 percent of the cost of the contract to be used for training under which industry receives a profit allowance on the money they spend for training. All of this is paid by the Federal Government.

The schools contend that their average cost of training is about \$27 per youth. This, however, is a matter of bookkeeping. For example, in one of our shops 3 teachers are assigned by the schools for training; each of these counts the total number in the class of 30 as trainees, although they are the same youth, thereby getting credit for training 90 youth, or 3 times the actual number of youth trained. In addition, not fully included as part of their cost of training, is rent, light, heat, janitor service, cost of materials, and other incidental overhead expenses, which are borne by N. Y. A.

Again, in training within industry, the schools pay instructors of foremen how to up-grade workers and estimate as trainees the total employees who profit ultimately from the training of foremen. Example: The instructor may train 15 foremen; each foreman may have 15 people under him; the teacher reports training 225 men. No overhead is included in such cases as part of the training cost.

The schools could not satisfactorily conduct the N. Y. A. shops less expensively if they should be turned over to them. As a matter of fact, the salaries paid are considerably higher than those paid by the N. Y. A. The average monthly cost of N. Y. A. foremen for 48 hours a week in Pennsylvania is approximately \$213; the schools pay from \$312 to \$416 per month on the same basis for foremen with the same qualifications, that is, mechanics with at least 6 years' experience in industry. The larger amount is paid in the big cities.

To turn them over to the schools, it would be necessary to negotiate separately with the school board where the shop is located in each individual case. It would be necessary to take complete inventory and process it under United States Treasury mandates. All this would delay the training of workers for months at a time when the national emergency does not brook a delay.

The War Manpower Commission recently gave out a statement in commendation of the N. Y. A. training program and gave as one reason that it is more flexible. N. Y. A. machinery can be readily moved from areas of labor scarcity to labor surplus areas, or to a place where it can best serve industry, and it can readily regulate the training in accordance with the job specifications outlined by industry. School machinery, on the other hand, cannot be moved across State lines. In fact, it has been found by the War Manpower Commission to be difficult to move school machinery within the State because of opposition by the local school board, business association, and Government.

Industry has the power of setting up its own training courses under a 2-percent-of-cost provision in war contracts.

However, of the 500 war industries to which N. Y. A. has furnished youth in Pennsylvania, only 10 have their own preemployment training classes. Those 10 have employed an average of 202 N. Y. A. youth each, in addition to those trained by themselves. See attached table.

In the cases of the large industries they soon exhaust the local trainees for their classes. In addition, most of the corporations do not have the space or available machinery to conduct training courses, and they prefer to have the N. Y. A. and the schools do it for them to free their own machines and staff for capacity production.

In estimating the cost of the N. Y. A. program there should be taken into consideration the fact that over one-third of our youth in the whole country are in resident work centers; that is, they are taken from communities where they have no adequate training facilities and are boarded at our center while in training. In this way the N. Y. A. is supplying industry with trained workers who would otherwise not be available, and thereby making a very substantial contribution to the labor market. Of course, the expense of these centers brings up our average cost.

Another consideration is that the administration of Federal funds is highly technical and the school personnel are not trained for it and it would take time to train them. As a matter of fact in most communities where N. Y. A. shops are located the superintendent of schools and the teachers have had no vocational-education training. In many localities the school board would not assume the financial obligations involved. The vocational-training appropriation requires them to finance the operations until the end of the fiscal year before they can be reimbursed. The delay involved by the transfer would be enormous and it would be a very costly and wasteful operation.

The N. Y. A. in this State alone has, during the first 8 months of the fiscal year since July 1, 1942, supplied 37,590 youth to industries having war contracts. The average monthly enrollment is 6,200. In Pennsylvania there are 95 shops. These include machine operation, welding, sheet-metal work, aviation sheet metal, radio assembly, radio code operation, aviation mechanics, aviation instrument repair, foundry and forge work, patternmaking, power sewing-machine operation, and woodworking.

I am attaching a list of some of the principal industries to which N. Y. A. has furnished youth in Pennsylvania and New Jersey. The N. Y. A. has many letters from war industries expressing satisfaction with N. Y. A. youth furnished them and urging the continuance of the N. Y. A. program.

The N. Y. A. shops are about 90 percent full. Most of the shops are located in communities that do not have adequate vocational training facilities.

The N. Y. A. has had good cooperation in Pennsylvania from the schools. As a matter of fact, about 1,500 high-school students are being trained in N. Y. A.

shops in the afternoon or evening, at the request of the high-school principals.

With the induction of boys into the service, the number of girls in our shops is increasing. We have a number of applications for training of women over 25 years of age, and also for the training at night of women who work during the day. We suggest that Congress make it possible for N. Y. A. to train persons over 25 years old and remove the restrictions that they must be unemployed, subject, however, to the approval of the War Manpower Commission, which would approve such training only if there were not sufficient facilities available in the schools, and facilities suitable for the training needed.

The following is a list of some of the principal industries to which the N. Y. A. has furnished youth in this region:

Sun Shipbuilding Co., Chester, Pa.	1,119
Naval stations	434
Army air depot, Middletown, Pa.	329
Dravo Corporation, Pittsburgh, Pa.	272
Bethlehem Steel Co., Bethlehem, Pa.	274
Glenn Martin Co., Baltimore, Md.	250
Piper Aircraft, Lock Haven, Pa.	229
Other Army stations	235
Westinghouse, Philadelphia, Pa.	216
Duplan Silk Co., Kingston, Pa.	181
New York Shipbuilding Co., Camden, N. J.	178
Baldwin's, Eddystone, Pa.	170
Pennsylvania R. R.	168
American Bridge Co., Ambridge, Pa.	155
Western Aircraft, Trenton, N. J.	143
Progressive Coat & Apron Co., Philadelphia, Pa.	142
Curtiss-Wright Co., Passaic, N. J.	141
Western Electric, Clifton, N. J.	129
Aviation Manufacturing Co., Williamsport, Pa.	130
A. Rief Textile Co., Philadelphia, Pa.	117
Charles May Textile Co., Philadelphia, Pa.	154
Sylvania Mfg. Co., Emporium, Pa.	112
U. S. Civil Service Commission	108
Armstrong Cork Co., Lancaster, Pa.	103
Foster Bros., Philadelphia, Pa.	90
Cramp Shipbuilding Co., Philadelphia, Pa.	100
Fleetwood Aircraft, Bristol, Pa.	88
National Fireworks Co., Elkton, Md.	88
Jacobs Aircraft, Pottsville, Pa.	88
American Car & Foundry	81
National Tube Co., Ellwood City, Pa.	76
Radio Corporation of America, Camden, N. J., and Lancaster, Pa.	74
Fairchild Corporation, Hagerstown, Md.	71
Carnegie-Illinois Steel Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.	65

Industries in Pennsylvania having pre-employment training classes N. Y. A. youth employed by them:

Sun Shipbuilding Co.	1,119
Dravo Corporation	272
Westinghouse	211
Lukens	44
S. K. F. Industries	23
Armstrong Cork Co.	103
Cramp Shipbuilding Co.	89
Brewster Aircraft	38
Brown Instrument Co.	0
Aviation Mfg. Co.	120
Total	2,019
Average	202

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the discussion of amendment of the Senate No. 5, I wish to call

the attention of the Members of the House to H. R. 786. The position of the subcommittee, as I understand it, is based upon the idea that anyone who is licensed under the laws of a particular State to practice a particular profession should be allowed to receive Federal funds under this bill in performance of his profession. I believe and earnestly insist that the Federal Government in extending funds for the payment of medical services should be able to designate the type of professional qualifications to be required from those practitioners. It has not been the policy of the Congress to follow the qualifications adopted by the State laws in matters of this kind. The present Employees' Compensation Act permits the payment of compensation to physicians and osteopathic practitioners who are licensed by State law. Many States authorize chiropractic practitioners to carry on their profession. H. R. 786 is filed for the purpose of including chiropractic practitioners under the Employees' Compensation Act. The fact that this bill is pending shows that we do not with Federal funds authorize the payment of anyone for rendering medical services who may be entitled to practice in a particular State. I feel that the position of the gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. Judd, is sound and that it should be supported.

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION

Mr. Speaker, while we are considering this bill I want to say a few words about amendment No. 30. I hope the House will recede from its disagreement and concur in the Senate amendment. At this time, when we are straining every effort to convert the materials and manpower resources of this country into our effort to win the war, I do not think that we can wisely take a chance on discontinuing the N. Y. A. It is unquestionably true that the N. Y. A. has rendered a good service in training boys and girls to do highly skilled war work. The war production of this country will need the services of every boy and girl who can be trained during the next year. The N. Y. A. is in a position to carry on this work, and I certainly hope the Members of the House will not take the chance of impeding the war effort by discontinuing the N. Y. A.

Everyone on this floor knows that the subcommittee made a most thorough and searching investigation of every facet of N. Y. A. and its recommendations were based upon the facts thus ascertained. Should not their recommendations have been followed? I for one believe that they should be.

It is true that measured by the size of its appropriation N. Y. A. does not loom large in our financial scheme of things. However, measured from the standpoint of its value to our youth and to the Nation, it is exceedingly important, now in the midst of war even as it was in pre-war days.

Long before war came, N. Y. A. had been moving to gear its efforts to the need for trained manpower which it clearly foresaw. It trained youth in construction and mechanical skills which were certain to be in demand, and they

were. As a result of its foresight a half million youth have been trained in the skills that plane manufacturers, shipyards, and the thousands of other war companies are crying for, and this great accomplishment has been packed into the relatively few months that separate us from Pearl Harbor.

To this great contribution to the war effort Tennessee has made its proportionate contribution. Approximately 1,000 Tennessee youth are currently in training and this training has been concentrated on machine-shop work, welding, and sheet-metal fabrication, particularly with reference to aircraft. Month by month the number of boys on the program has decreased and the number of girls has increased until at the present time they are about even. Over 2,000 of these youth have entered employment since the commencement of this fiscal year and have lent the strength of their arms and the skill of their hands to fashioning the implements of war.

To the shipyards in other States we have provided hundreds of welders and other skilled mechanics, and from all reports that have come to my ears they have acquitted themselves well, as was to be expected. The industries to which they have gone have sent back requests that more Tennessee youth as well trained as those that have come to them be provided. I need but mention corporations such as the Engle Shipbuilding at Pascagoula, Miss., and the Jones Construction Co. at Panama City, Fla., to make clear the vital importance of the production in which Tennessee youth are participating. This is not to say that there have not been hundreds of placements within the State because there have been with such corporations as Vultee Aircraft at Nashville and many others. Had it not been for N. Y. A. and the training facilities which it offers it is certain that many of these youth could not have made that contribution to the war effort which they are now making.

In thinking about these things it has often occurred to me that the value of N. Y. A. is not appreciated as generally as it should be, because we think of manpower as being composed of units that are identical—in other words that we are dealing with a problem that is purely quantitative. Nothing could be further from the truth, for the manpower problem is qualitative as well as quantitative. What would happen if all machinists, for example, were suddenly withdrawn from industry? We know that the wheels of industry would grind to a slow stop for, without machinists, industry cannot operate. Take away welders and the ships which we are turning out in such incredible numbers would not be possible. In the light of these facts is it not apparent that the National Youth Administration has done much more than merely to supply industry with over a half million men and women in little more than a year. The outstanding fact about these half million is that most of them have been thoroughly trained as welders, as radio technicians, as machine shop helpers and in a score of other skills which are indispensable in the building of the tools of war.

I am aware that there are those who suggest that industry can do all the training that is necessary. I recognize fully the immense capacity of American industry but I recognize also that they are being called upon to produce war goods in such quantities that the energies of management, foremen and workers alike are being stretched to the limit. I think it is utterly absurd even to suggest that industry now be saddled with this additional task.

Yet there are those who now, at the very hour when the crisis approaches, would destroy this agency that has in peace and in war made such magnificent contributions to the Nation. In my humble estimation such a proposal is as incomprehensible as it is indefensible.

I think of what N. Y. A. has meant to the Tennessee youth who were and are eager to lend their hand to the war effort. I think of the Tennessee youth who, through the earnings made possible by N. Y. A., were enabled thereby to complete their college education, so that as engineers, chemists, physicists, they could go forth to lend their aid to the war effort. I think of these things and then wonder if we are in our good senses in wanting to destroy this agency now in the midst of war, when we need the maximum skill of the hands that toil, the maximum learning that educated men can bring to bear upon the immensely complicated problems confronting us.

Our action upon N. Y. A. will be for me a portent of the future. If in the midst of war we destroy an agency that is making a great contribution to the winning of the war, what may we do when peace again returns and the ties which now bind, or should bind us, are torn?

Gentlemen, no good can flow from such action. We are at war, when our every action must conform to the needs of war and the needs of war clearly demand that this agency be continued. We must take action to assure that this is done.

SENATE CONFIRMATION AMENDMENT SHOULD BE REJECTED

Amendment No. 24, which was placed on this bill by the Senate would require confirmation by that body of all persons appointed to positions for general administration of the War Manpower Commission whose salaries are at the rate of \$4,500 per annum or more. I am glad the managers on the part of the House will move to insist on disagreement with that amendment. This amendment is the entering wedge of an effort to place the executive control of the Government in the hands of the Senate. If this amendment were adopted a similar provision would be attached to every appropriation bill and thus the constitutional responsibility of operating the executive department of the Government would be transferred to the Senate. This would bring about a division of responsibility which would promote inefficiency and would greatly disrupt the effective operation of many governmental agencies. Senatorial courtesy would require that Senators of every State pass on

the confirmation of Federal employees doing work in their particular States. Thus agencies in the various States would be directed by the Senators of those States. This was not the intention of article II, section 2, of the Constitution, which requires the confirmation of officers of the United States. A review of the proceedings of the Constitutional Convention will show that the framers of the Constitution only had in mind the superior executive officers who are the administrators of the various agencies. In 1820 Thomas Jefferson in a letter to James Madison very forcibly pointed out the evils which would come from a provision like this.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 121]

Auchincloss	Gifford	O'Leary
Baldwin, Md.	Gossett	Pfeiffer
Baldwin, N. Y.	Green	Phillips
Barden	Hall	Plumley
Barry	Edwin Arthur	Reed, Ill.
Bell	Hall	Robison, Ky.
Bloom	Leonard W.	Rogers, Calif.
Bonner	Hébert	Russell
Bradley, Mich.	Hollifield	Shafer
Buckley	Horan	Sheppard
Burchill, N. Y.	Izac	Sheridan
Burgin	Johnson	Snyder
Byrne	Lyndon B.	Starnes, Ala.
Cannon, Mo.	Johnson, Ward	Stearns, N. H.
Capozzoli	Kilburn	Taber
Chipperfield	King	Tolan
Cochran	Kleberg	Treadway
Cooley	Lambertson	Van Zandt
Culkin	Lea	Vinson, Ga.
Eaton	Lesinski	Voorhis, Calif.
Fay	Luce	Vorys, Ohio
Fitzpatrick	Ludlow	Wadsworth
Ford	Maas	Wasielewski
Fulbright	Mansfield, Tex.	Wheelchel, Ga.
Fulmer	Merritt	White
Furlong	Morrison, N. C.	Woodrum, Va.
Gallagher	O'Hara	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and fifty-three Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. JUDD. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JUDD moves to recommit the bill to the conferees with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to concur in Senate amendment No. 5 without amendment.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JUDD) there were yeas 25 and noes 88.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present, and I object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant-at-Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 152, nays 212, not voting 67, as follows:

[Roll No. 122]

YEAS—152

Allen, Ill.	Hart	Outland
Allen, La.	Hays	Peterson, Fla.
Andresen	Heffernan	Poage
August H.	Heidinger	Powers
Andrews	Herter	Pracht
Angell	Hoeven	Price
Auchincloss	Jeffrey	Priest
Barrett	Jensen	Ramey
Bates, Ky.	Judd	Randolph
Bennett, Mich.	Kean	Rankin
Bishop	Kearney	Reed, N. Y.
Brooks	Kefauver	Rodgers, Pa.
Brown, Ohio	Kelley	Rogers, Calif.
Bulwinkle	Kennedy	Rohrbough
Celler	Keogh	Rolph
Chipperfield	Kilday	Rowan
Clark	Kinzer	Scanlon
Clason	Klein	Schuetz
Cole, N. Y.	Knutson	Schwabe
Cravens	Kunkel	Scott
Creal	LaFollette	Sikes
Cunningham	Lambertson	Simpson, Ill.
Curtis	Lane	Simpson, Pa.
Davis	LeCompte	Slaughter
Dawson	LeFevre	Snyder
Dickstein	Lewis	Sparkman
Dingell	Lynch	Stanley
Disney	McCowan	Stewart
Doughton	McGranery	Sullivan
Douglas	McKenzie	Sundstrom
Durham	McMurray	Taber
Ellsworth	Maas	Talle
Fenton	Madden	Taylor
Fisher	Mansfield	Thomason
Fogarty	Mont	Tibbott
Forand	Marcantonio	Towe
Fulbright	Martin, Iowa	Troutman
Gale	Miller, Conn.	Wadsworth
Gathings	Miller, Mo.	Walter
Gavagan	Miller, Nebr.	Weiss
Gavin	Miller, Pa.	Welch
Gerlach	Monroney	Wene
Gilchrist	Mruk	Wheat
Gillette	Murphy	Wheelchel, Ga.
Gordon	Murray, Wis.	Willey
Gorski	Norman	Wolcott
Graham	Norrell	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gross	Norton	Wolverton, N. J.
Hagen	O'Brien, Ill.	Woodruff, Mich.
Hale	O'Brien, N. Y.	Wright
Halleck	O'Konski	
Harris, Ark.	O'Toole	

NAYS—212

Abernethy	Brehm	Coffee
Andersen	Brown, Ga.	Cole, Mo.
H. Carl	Bryson	Colmer
Anderson, Calif.	Buffett	Compton
Anderson	Burch, Va.	Cooper
N. Mex.	Busbey	Costello
Arends	Butler	Courtney
Arnold	Camp	Cox
Bates, Mass.	Canfield	Crawford
Beall	Cannon, Fla.	Crosser
Beckworth	Cannon, Mo.	Cullen
Bender	Carlson, Kans.	Curley
Bennett, Mo.	Carson, Ohio	D'Alessandro
Blackney	Carter	Day
Bolton	Case	Delaney
Bonner	Chapman	Dewey
Boren	Chenoweth	Dies
Boykin	Church	Dillweg
Bradley, Pa.	Clevenger	Dirksen

Ditter	Johnson,	Reed, Ill.
Domengeaux	Calvin D.	Rees, Kans.
Domere	Johnson, Ind.	Richards
Drewry	Johnson,	Rivers
Dworshak	Luther A.	Rizley
Eaton	Johnson,	Robertson
Eberharter	Lyndon B.	Robinson, Utah
Elliott	Johnson, Okla.	Rockwell
Ellis	Jones	Rogers, Mass.
Ellison, Md.	Jonkman	Rowe
Elmer	Kee	Sadowski
Elston, Ohio	Keefe	Sasscer
Engel	Kerr	Satterfield
Feighan	Kirwan	Sauthoff
Fellows	Landis	Schiffner
Fernandez	Lanham	Smith, Maine
Fish	Larcade	Smith, Ohio
Flannagan	Lea	Smith, Va.
Folger	Lenke	Smith, W. Va.
Gamble	Ludlow	Smith, Wis.
Gibson	McCord	Somers, N. Y.
Gillie	McCormack	Spence
Goodwin	McGehee	Springer
Gore	McGregor	Stearns, N. H.
Gossett	McMillan	Stefan
Granger	McWilliams	Stevenson
Grant, Ala.	Magnuson	Stockman
Grant, Ind.	Mahon	Summer, Ill.
Gregory	Maloney	Summers, Tex.
Griffiths	Manasco	Talbot
Gwynne	Martin, Mass.	Tarver
Hancock	Mason	Thomas, N. J.
Hare	May	Thomas, Tex.
Harless, Ariz.	Marrow	Vincent, Ky.
Harris, Va.	Michener	Voorhis, Calif.
Hartley	Mills	Vorys, Ohio
Hendricks	Monkiewicz	Vursell
Hess	Morrison, La.	Ward
Hill	Mundt	Weaver
Hinshaw	Murdock	Weichel, Ohio
Hobbs	Murray, Tenn.	West
Hoch	Myers	Whitten
Hoffman	Newsome	Whittington
Holmes, Mass.	Nichols	Wickersham
Holmes, Wash.	O'Brien, Mich.	Wigglesworth
Hope	O'Connor	Wilson
Horan	Pace	Winstead
Howell	Patton	Winter
Hull	Peterson, Ga.	Woodrum, Va.
Jackson	Philbin	Worley
Jarman	Pittenger	Zimmerman
Jenkins	Ploesser	
Jennings	Rabaut	
Johnson,	Ramspeck	
Anton, J.	Reece, Tenn.	

NOT VOTING—67

Baldwin, Md.	Gifford	O'Leary
Baldwin, N. Y.	Green	O'Neal
Barden	Hall	Patman
Barry	Edwin Arthur	Pfeiffer
Bell	Hall,	Phillips
Bland	Leonard W.	Plumley
Bloom	Harness, Ind.	Poulson
Bradley, Mich.	Hébert	Robison, Ky.
Buckley	Hollifield	Russell
Burchill, N. Y.	Izac	Sabath
Burdick	Johnson,	Shafer
Burgin	J. Leroy	Sheppard
Byrne	Johnson, Ward	Sheridan
Capozzoli	Kilburn	Short
Cochran	King	Starnes, Ala.
Cooley	Kleberg	Steagall
Culkin	Lesinski	Tolan
Fay	Luce	Treadway
Fitzpatrick	McLean	Van Zandt
Ford	Mansfield, Tex.	Vinson, Ga.
Fulmer	Merritt	Wastelewski
Furlong	Morrison, N. C.	White
Gallagher	Mott	
Gearhart	O'Hara	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

General pairs:

Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Ward Johnson.
 Mr. Barry with Mr. Short.
 Mr. Ford with Mr. Baldwin of New York.
 Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. McLean.
 Mr. Dland with Mr. Shafer.
 Mr. Cooley with Mr. Gallagher.
 Mr. Byrne with Mr. Robison of Kentucky.
 Mr. King with Mr. Gifford.
 Mr. Cochran with Mr. Phillips.
 Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
 Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Treadway.
 Mr. Starnes of Alabama with Mrs. Luce.
 Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Izac with Mr. Plumley.
 Mr. Pfeiffer with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.
 Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Culkin.
 Mr. Fay with Mr. Harness of Indiana.
 Mr. Merritt with Mr. O'Hara.
 Mr. Tolman with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.
 Mr. Mansfield of Montana with Mr. J. Leroy Johnson.

Mr. Burchill of New York with Mr. Van Zandt.

Mr. Mansfield of Texas with Mr. Poulson.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my vote of "no" and vote "aye."

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my vote of "no" and vote "aye."

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my vote of "aye" and vote "no."

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my vote of "aye" and vote "no."

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my vote of "no" and vote "aye."

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my vote of "aye" and vote "no."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina to adopt the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 19: Page 58, line 12, after the figures, strike out the balance of the line and lines 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HARE moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 19, with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken out and insert at the end thereof, and before the period, the following proviso: "Provided, That hereafter notice of such agreement shall have been posted in the plant affected for said period of 3 months, said notice containing information as to the location at an accessible place of such agreement where said agreement shall be open for inspection by any interested person."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Virginia moves to recede and concur in said Senate amendment No. 19.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the motion of the gentleman from Virginia be divided.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recede.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from South Carolina, in view of the motion that he made, and which I did not hear, what the parliamentary situation is with reference to my proceeding.

Mr. HARE. The motion was that the gentleman's motion be divided, and the first part has been voted on.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. What is the parliamentary status?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia moved that the House recede and concur, and the House voted to recede. The question now is on the motion to concur.

The gentleman from Virginia was yielded 10 minutes by the gentleman from South Carolina and has been recognized.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, may I submit a parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TARVER. Under the motion to concur, the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina to concur with an amendment would still be in order?

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARE. Would the motion I made to recede and concur with an amendment be voted on prior to the motion made by the gentleman from Virginia.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has no motion pending to concur with an amendment. The motion to recede was carried. Does the gentleman from South Carolina desire to make a motion to concur with an amendment?

Mr. HARE. I offer such a motion, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HARE moves that the House agree to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19 with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment and insert at the end thereof, and before the period, the following proviso: "Provided, That, hereafter, notice of such agreement shall have been posted in the plant affected for said period of 3 months, said notice containing information as to the location at an accessible place of such agreement where such agreement shall be opened for inspection by any interested person."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Is not my motion a preferential motion? Should it not be voted on first?

The SPEAKER. After the House has receded, a motion to concur with an amendment takes precedence over a motion to concur. The gentleman has left of his motion only the proposition to concur, because the House voted to recede. Then the gentleman from South Carolina offered a preferential motion to concur with an amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Then, Mr. Speaker, if the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina is voted down my motion will be in order?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary situation then is that the vote comes first on the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina to concur with an amendment. If that is voted down then my motion which is to recede and concur in the action taken by

the Senate will be in order. I will be just as brief as I can.

Mr. Speaker, for over 2 years this House and the country felt rather indignant at the policy that has been pursued by certain labor organizations in setting up their headquarters and their offices at cantonments, and at Government works all over the United States, entering into more or less phony contracts with the contractors for a closed shop. The net result of this was that your constituents and mine who lived in the vicinity of those public works and wanted jobs had to pay tribute to labor unions, become members of a union, pay an initiation fee, and then pay dues to go to work for his Government. You are all familiar with that.

The thing that brings this about is the fact that the same thing happened out at the Kaiser shipyard. I am informed that Kaiser entered into one of these closed-shop contracts with the A. F. of L. when he had only 66 men working for him. Then, of course, the operation mushroomed out and became quite an important contract with some 25,000 employees. Some of those fellows object to living up to a contract which was made before they secured employment with the plant.

That amendment was put on in the House; it was stricken out in the Senate. The motion of the gentleman from South Carolina is to concur with an amendment which would ratify all of those contracts provided they had been in existence for 60 days; in other words, if this Kaiser contract is a spurious contract, a "phony" contract, then when you vote for the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina you solemnly put the stamp of approval of the Congress of the United States upon a spurious contract, doing the thing that this House has been complaining about for 2 years, namely, requiring people to pay tribute to a labor union for the privilege of working for their country in a war industry. I do not think the gentleman from South Carolina really wanted to do that.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I just put that proposition to you. If you vote for the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina you amend the National Labor Relations Act by taking away the jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board to investigate these contracts that are claimed to be spurious and you take away their jurisdiction to permit the employees of those plants to hold an election to determine whether they want this union or that union. I just do not think these gentlemen thoroughly realize the extent of what they are doing.

I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman quite inadvertently said 60 days. I know he meant 3 months.

The purpose of the amendment has been correctly diagnosed by the gentleman from Virginia. The members of the committee who are sponsoring the

proviso feel that under present conditions there ought not to be permitted any labor trouble or dispute in the war shipyards which would have the effect of interfering with production for the war effort now being so successfully carried on there and we are willing so far as we are concerned to legislate with reference to that particular situation and to try by the adoption of this proviso to prevent the disruption of labor relations in the Kaiser yards.

Those who entertain the views of the gentleman from Virginia, that the National Labor Relations Board jurisdiction in that case ought not to be removed should, of course, support his motion. The issue is clear: It is just a question of whether or not we are going to permit the C. I. O. to come into that shipyard situation with the backing of the National Labor Relations Board and stir up trouble which would not otherwise exist.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I want to answer briefly the gentleman from Georgia. He and I are agreed about the facts as he stated them, except if you are going to take away the jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board to hold an election amongst the employees of the Kaiser plant to determine who they want to represent them, if that is what they want to do, and that is what the gentleman from Georgia says they want to do—

Mr. TARVER. I agreed with the gentleman who said that is what we want to do. We are in agreement on that. The agreement was in effect more than 3 months without complaint.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. If you are trying to do that, then you want to take away their jurisdiction to hold an election in any war plant. In other words, should you not repeal the Labor Relations Act during the period of the war? That is in effect what you do. Why should you have an election in any plant? If you follow the statement of the gentleman from Georgia the effect of the amendment is to stop all employees from having the democratic right to vote under the National Labor Relations Act as to who they want to represent them and to that extent repeals the National Labor Relations Act. Is that not a perfectly clear proposition? Are not the gentleman from Georgia and I agreed on it? Why make an exception and try to say that the Kaiser Co. is a special case?

As a matter of fact, the language which they have adopted does not make the Kaiser Co. a special case. The language applies to every case and the language which they have adopted in effect says: "If you have entered into a phoney contract and if you have gotten by with it for 90 days, then, we, the Congress of the United States, hereby put our stamp of approval upon the phoney contract which you have made and have gotten away with."

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. May not that provision affect the bill we just passed a few days ago providing for elections?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I think it would. It is impossible to predict what may be the ultimate effect of trying to write such an amendment to the Labor Relations Act in an appropriation bill here on the floor of the House when 9 out of 10 Members do not understand what it is.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I am a little bit confused and perplexed at the gentleman's statement.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Am I mistaken in this: Is the gentleman defending the National Labor Relations Board at the present time?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am defending the act of Congress as it is and I am defending the jurisdiction of the Board to do the things that the Congress told them to do.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. Speaking of the Kaiser yard, is it not a fact that if the National Labor Relations Board should hold the A. F. of L. contract not a closed-shop contract, and it would be what the gentleman has referred to as a phoney contract, and held an election and the C. I. O. should become the bargaining union, would that not result in a closed shop just the same as it is now except the C. I. O. would control it instead of the A. F. of L.?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The only difference would be that the majority of the employees as contemplated in the law would decide whom they wanted to represent them. I do not know whether they want the C. I. O. or A. F. of L. That is not the question at all. The question is whether under the democratic processes provided by the National Labor Relations Act these people, 25,000 of them, shall have the right to say whether they want the A. F. of L. or C. I. O. They may vote for one or the other. They will probably vote for the A. F. of L., but I want them to have that right which the law gives them.

Mr. MOTT. I may say that the National Labor Relations Board has messed up that situation in the Kaiser yard to a great extent, and I may say further that if the C. I. O. got control there, it would not guarantee anyone the right to work for the Government without paying a fee.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am not talking about that particular controversy. I am talking about the National Labor Relations Act and the unwisdom of trying to amend it on the floor of the House.

Mr. KLEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KLEIN. I would like to understand the gentleman correctly. If the gentleman's motion carries, does it mean that any group of employees could go in

and bargain for the union of their own choice?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is what the law provides. If you adopt the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina you take that right away from them.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman's motion would keep in force and effect the existing powers of the National Labor Relations Board as given to it by the National Labor Relations Act.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, in order to get this picture clearly before the membership, I would like to read, for the benefit of the House, the provision carried in the House bill which passed 10 days or 2 weeks ago:

No part of the funds appropriated in this title shall be used in any way in connection with a complaint case arising over an agreement between management and labor which had been in existence for 3 months or longer without complaint being filed.

That simply means that where an agreement has been entered into by a bargaining agency of any group of employees with the management and the agreement or contract has been in full force and effect for at least 3 months and no complaint has been made in the meantime, it would then be unlawful for the Board to take jurisdiction so long as this appropriation is available. That is, this appropriation could not be used to supplement or implement or encourage someone after it had been in operation for 3 months without complaint to go into this plant and encourage the employees to join another bargaining agency and have another election during the next 9 months. That is all there is to it.

There was no objection to that amendment when it passed the House. The Senate struck out that amendment, as I understand, not because there was any particular objection to it, as the RECORD will show, but because the Senate thought there should be additional language, and in the conference the Senate conferees suggested additional language, which the House conferees accepted. I want to read the additional language for the benefit of those present:

Provided, That hereafter notice of such agreement shall have been posted in the plant affected for said period of 3 months, said notice containing information as to the location at an accessible place of such agreement where said agreement shall be open for inspection by any interested person.

This language added to the original proviso in the bill simply means that hereafter when an agreement is entered into between management and the bargaining agency of the employees' notice shall be posted in the plant that such an agreement has been effected, and that notice shall contain information as to where the agreement shall be inspected.

It does not say that the notice must be posted but it says that if they expect to be protected under the 3 months' limitation it shall be posted. There is no law requiring it to be posted. It only provides that if those entering into the agreement want the agreement protected and defended by the law to prevent some racketeer from coming in later and stirring up the employees so that they will say, "We want another election, we want to join another union, or we want to do this, that, or the other," those who entered into the agreement, which under the law they had a right to do, would be protected at the expiration of the 3 months' period if such notice were posted and filed for inspection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. If employees are dissatisfied with the representatives they have, when could they get an election?

Mr. HARE. Any time within 3 months.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. But suppose a phony contract goes along and passes the 3 months' period, then they are helpless, they cannot do anything about it.

Mr. HARE. A phony contract?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. HARE. No; it would not be phony because it must be published.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Suppose it is published and still is "phony"; they cannot do anything about it, can they?

Mr. HARE. Suppose the gentleman has entered into a contract with Mr. A, for example, notice is posted, and the agreement is over here in this corridor where it can be inspected, and I for example, as an employee of the gentleman, fail to inspect it within 3 months, nobody has trespassed upon my rights.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Suppose it is a perfectly bona fide contract and I do inspect it and it is over 3 months old and the employees get dissatisfied with their present representative and want to change their bargaining representative, how can they do it?

Mr. HARE. They cannot do it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. In other words, the bargaining agent they choose at one election is there forever, is he not?

Mr. HARE. No; not forever, but only so long as this appropriation is available.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not want to make a speech, but I do want to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. HARE. If a contract has been in force for 3 months and the individual has been satisfied with it for 3 months he will have notice of it all of this time. If he has been satisfied with it for 3 months and someone comes along and makes him dissatisfied, then he is estopped for the next 9 months from filing a complaint and being considered by the National Labor Relations Board.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. How long does that condition prevail? How long is he tied to that contract before he can change his mind and get another bargaining agent?

Mr. HARE. At the expiration of the appropriation carried in this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. In other words, until 1944 his hands are tied?

Mr. HARE. That is right. If he acquiesces in it for 3 months and makes no complaint, the idea is that he is satisfied. He has had plenty of time to consider it, plenty of time to deliberate. If somebody comes along and makes him dissatisfied after that, then he is stopped from expressing his dissatisfaction. The purpose of this amendment is to prevent racketeers interfering with the production in the war industries of this country. There is no attempt to amend the National Labor Relations Act. This is only an attempt to have orderly procedure and orderly conduct and, if people are satisfied, to prevent some racketeer from bringing in additional information, or new news, so to speak, and arranging in some way to discourage production in a plant or production in another plant, thus continuing to have turmoil throughout the country in our war-production plants.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. O'NEAL. I should like to know what is the purpose that is sought to be accomplished here. What evil is there in the existing law that requires a committee to take some legislative action on an appropriation bill? What evil are you trying to correct?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

We are trying to correct the evil of racketeers going into plants where everything is going along smoothly, where everybody seems to be satisfied, and propagandizing the employees, so that in a week or a month or 2 months the racketeers will have a sufficient following to proceed to file a complaint or have an investigation made and have a new election, thus causing additional expense on the part of the Government to hold the election; whereas if the racketeer had kept his hands in his own business and allowed the people to do their own thinking, they would continue maximum production without any interference.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Why is there not provided in the proposed legislation a space between the time when these elections may be held, instead of having it couched in this language? I understood the gentleman to say it would be 9 months before they could have another election.

Mr. HARE. No; 9 months on this assumption. Suppose we made an agreement on July 1, today. Or suppose an agreement is made between an employer and his employees. That agreement is posed in the plant, where the employees have a right to see it.

Now, if they go 3 months and no complaint is made by anyone, then under this provision here it would be 9 months after before any action could be taken.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. Yes.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. The gentleman did not answer the question. Why do you not put specific language in there that would provide that 9 months should elapse between the expiration of the 3 months and the opportunity to investigate? May I make this observation?

Mr. HARE. The gentleman is taking my time.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I just want to make this suggestion. Frequently with regard to prohibition elections, that is, elections like we used to have, it was provided that a reasonable length of time should intervene between these opportunities. That is what you are trying to do in this particular situation?

Mr. HARE. That is right.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. You want to avoid a period of continued agitation?

Mr. HARE. Yes.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Why don't you write it specifically into the enactment?

Mr. HARE. This is an appropriation bill, and that would be legislation, which would be subject to a point of order. We are trying to accomplish the same thing by a limitation on the appropriation which is the parliamentary procedure.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Under the hypothetical case the gentleman states, does he mean it will be 9 months before the Board on its motion could intervene, or does he mean it would be 9 months before the men employed by that employer could make a complaint with the Board?

Mr. HARE. What I mean is that the Board would not have the right to go in, would not have the right to intervene.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. But if complaint were made by the men?

Mr. HARE. That would be a different matter.

Mr. DIRKSEN. As I understand it, it would not make any difference how many complaints piled up after the 3-month period.

Mr. HARE. The Board would not have jurisdiction to investigate that case.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In other words, the gentleman freezes the condition for 9 months irrespective of the matter of complaint.

Mr. HARE. Yes. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The

Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 123]

Andresen,	Gallagher	Merritt
August H.	Gearhart	Morrison, N. C.
Baldwin, Md.	Gifford	Nichols
Barden	Green	O'Hara
Barry	Hall	O'Leary
Bloom	Edwin Arthur	Pfeifer
Bradley, Mich.	Hall	Phillips
Buckley	Leonard W.	Plumley
Burchill, N. Y.	Harness, Ind.	Robison, Ky.
Byrne	Hébert	Russell
Cannon, Mo.	Hollifield	Sabath
Capozzoli	Izac	Shafer
Cochran	Johnson, Ind.	Sheppard
Culkin	Johnson,	Sheridan
Dewey	J. Leroy	Tolan
Eaton	Johnson, Ward	Treadway
Ellsworth	Kilburn	Van Zandt
Fay	King	Vinson, Ga.
Fitzpatrick	Lea	Vorys, Ohio
Ford	Lesinski	Wadsworth
Fulbright	Luce	West
Fulmer	McLean	
Furlong	Mansfield, Tex.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll 370 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I recognize that the House should not be in any way convinced by any interpretation of the law that I might make, because I am not a lawyer, and I am no expert on labor law. I do hope, however, that I may supplement to some degree the statement made by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE] and try to point out some of the difficulties under which the conferees labored. It is true that the House took a certain action on this matter. That action would have prevented the National Labor Relations Board from interfering with what is known as the Kaiser case. That went to the Senate, and the Senate struck out the House language. If that fact stood by itself, it would be important and significant to us, but I think the Members ought to remember what the Senate was trying to do, and while I am not going to go too far, I do suggest that they turn to page 6567 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and see the observations of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the observations of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the observations of the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. Members will then see that the Senate was then trying to find new and more satisfactory language, and the Members did not have time to complete the work, and merely suggested that the matter go to conference where an attempt could be made to iron it out. I think that many times in the conference we were all disposed to give up and call it a day. I am not in a position to say whether this final language is good or bad. These people who are particularly interested in it and who

seem to have made investigation think this language would accomplish what they want to do.

I think I understand what the situation is. If you adopt the suggestion of the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE], you will in effect be saying that all existing contracts are frozen as they are, as far as an investigation by the National Labor Relations Board is concerned. As to whether they have been filed for 90 days heretofore or not does not matter. It is only hereafter that the 90-day provision applies, and you do say that all these contracts, whether phony or not, cannot be set aside by the National Labor Relations Board. If you do not think that is proper practice, then you follow the alternative and support the suggestion of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], which in effect restores the Senate language, and does give authority and permission to the Board to interfere in these cases.

All I seek to point out to you is an extremely complicated matter. Personally I felt the place to iron out labor legislation was before the proper legislative committees of the House and not before the Appropriations Committee. I do think it is bad legislation, but I certainly was in no position to be an expert upon it, and I simply went along with the group.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield.

Mrs. NORTON. Does not the gentleman believe that in effect this is simply bringing to the floor of the House a jurisdictional dispute between two labor organizations?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. It quite obviously was, if you had seen the people from both camps sitting around us suggesting to us which way to vote. It is pretty hard for a person who knows nothing about the complete circumstances to take action upon it.

This amendment represents a sincere endeavor to say that we are going to try to stabilize the labor situation where it is and that from this time on there shall be no raiding. We had available the testimony of people who had made a study of the national defense situation. They had very pronounced views on the subject, and after going round and round and people drawing their own versions and suggestions, this is the language we approved. It is not the last word in human wisdom. It cannot be when the conferees got together for only a very short period. But a sincere effort was made to present the issue to you. If you feel that the National Labor Relations Board should not interfere in any of these controversies, naturally the House language is desirable. If you feel it should interfere, then the original position taken by the Senate is all right. But if you wish to say that hereafter there shall be no raiding, then the language adopted by the conferees would be the language you should favor.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, any position which brings together the support of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], will, in my judgment, bear most careful scrutiny. I have never been known as an A. F. of L. man or a C. I. O. man. I have tried to be fair to both organizations. I have a great many members of both organizations in my district, although the members of the C. I. O. predominate. As far as the A. F. of L. is concerned, I am enjoying the honor of being with the majority of you on their prescribed list, posted as an enemy of labor, and they are dedicated to the task of eliminating me from the Congress next year, as they are dedicated to the task of eliminating a majority of you, because we voted for the anti-strike bill. So I am not partisan in this matter from the standpoint of the A. F. of L. or the C. I. O. The only thing I had in mind in participating in writing this proviso was to try to do something to prevent the interruption of essential production for the war effort.

All of the shipyards on the Pacific coast, according to the evidence before us, with the exception of three small yards, were operating under a master agreement with the A. F. of L. When these two new yards of Mr. Kaiser were projected, the master agreement, before a majority of the employees were employed, was extended with the consent and authority of the administration in Washington to these proposed new units. According to the evidence before our committee, it might have been difficult to have gotten the necessary employees for use in the construction of these yards without that having been done, since those employees were members of the A. F. of L. and would have been unwilling to go into a yard where an agreement making the A. F. of L. the bargaining agent of employees of the yard was not in effect.

Now, one thing is clearly apparent, and that is that this threatened interposition of the National Labor Relations Board in the affairs of the two Kaiser shipyards in question is almost certain to bring about very material interruption in the very fine record being made by those yards in the building of ships for the war effort. This is not a permanent amendment to the National Labor Relations Act. This is an emergency measure. It is only to be effective for the 12 months that this appropriation bill is effective, and it is intended to prevent during those 12 months the interruption of production in those two shipyards or in any other plants which are similarly situated. Ordinarily I do not believe that any bargaining agent for employees should be selected until a majority of those who are to be employed can take part in the selection.

It was our information that the C. I. O. is preparing to raid, as the saying goes, quite a number of other industrial plants of the country if they are successful in their efforts to get the National Labor Relations Board to hold this election and install them as bargaining agents for the two Kaiser shipyards on the west coast. We think that, regardless of the merits of the controversy, it would be extremely unfortunate to have such a controversy interfering with production at this particular time, and that the doctrine of the greatest good for the greatest number, that is, the matter of securing greatest efficiency in production for the war effort, should be the most important objective governing our actions. With that reason in view we should enact this proviso and stop this squabbling out there on the Pacific coast or anywhere else in the country until this emergency is over, especially when the contract, whether it was proper at the time of its inception or not has been in effect for 3 months without complaint.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. ENGEL. The gentleman has mentioned the Kaiser case. As a matter of fact, there are a number of cases in which we have the same situation. The gentleman from Georgia will recall that a Member of the other body, a member of the conference committee, cited a case in his State where the production of magnesium was very much interfered with by a similar situation.

Mr. TARVER. And we understand a large number of other cases are pending. Unless this is done, war production will be seriously interfered with.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH].

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I am not concerned as to who is the union bargaining agent in the Kaiser plant in Portland, Oreg. I am, however, seriously concerned in the production of ships to win this war. Kaiser launched a ship in one of his Columbia River plants in 4 days, 15 hours, and 21 minutes. That ship was on her way to the Solomon Islands with a cargo in 14½ days.

Will an election as advocated by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] increase that record? That is a matter for this House to determine. Mr. Speaker, I hold no brief for either the A. F. of L. or the C. I. O., but I seriously believe that an election held at this time would slow down production in the Portland shipyard.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to clearly understand exactly what we are doing this afternoon with respect to this amendment.

Insofar as the relationship between the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L. is concerned, if this committee amendment is adopted

it will cut both ways. While the Kaiser case evidently is the outstanding case and the one which perhaps prompted the A. F. of L. to suggest this amendment, there are other cases of the same character. I have no hesitancy in saying that this amendment represents the position of the American Federation of Labor. Its representative came before our committee and clearly made its position known. There should be no misunderstanding about that at all. There is no doubt in my mind but what it was precipitated by the situation that exists out in the Kaiser yard. I want, in these few remarks, to see if we cannot understand just what the facts are before we vote.

I think it may be fair to say that when the original contract was entered into out on the west coast, at least so far as the evidence disclosed before our committee, there was a stabilization plan that had the full approval of the interested government agencies here in Washington.

A contract was entered into for the purpose of stabilizing employment in the shipbuilding industries on the west coast. At the time those contracts were entered into in 3 Kaiser yards he had a comparatively small number of employees. That number has grown. I understand, to nearly 80,000 and there is a steady toll of money clicking into the till of the collective bargaining agency. This has now attracted the attention of the rival union and they are out there trying to stir up an election so they can get the collective bargaining rights and I suppose transfer that roll of gold into their own till instead of into the till of the A. F. of L. Fundamentally to me that is the fight that exists as far as the Kaiser plant is concerned. There is no fight as far as wages are concerned; those are fixed by the Government. There is no fight over working conditions or housing or anything else; they are all determined by the Government. The sole question is the question of representation and bargaining authority, and going with that is the right to collect the dues and determine to which till it is going. As far as I personally am concerned I have no interest one way or the other except to see that production is maintained.

The contention was made to the committee by those who ought to know that if the National Labor Relations Board is to be permitted to order elections in all of these cases where representation is disputed in plants, you are going to have a political election in every one of these plants that will run over a period of weeks and very seriously interfere with production.

The attitude of the Senate conferees very clearly was that we as a Congress should endeavor to see if we could not stabilize conditions at least for the duration and allow these bargaining rights under existing contracts to remain as they are, provided they have been in existence for a period of 3 months without a complaint being filed. As to any future contract, if a complaint is filed within 90 days after its posting in the plant affected then as a matter of course

the N. L. R. B. will have jurisdiction to order an election. It relates only to placing these existing contracts in status quo. If you vote for the committee amendment you are voting to freeze the contracts that have been in existence for a period of 3 months or more without a complaint being registered against them. That is all there is to it. I believe when we vote we should know exactly what we are doing.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, all there is to this amendment is to keep the National Labor Relations Board from going out on its own petition and stirring up trouble and creating labor dissension in this country. This amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina makes it perfectly clear that every man who goes to work in these plants has access to and knows about the agreements that are in existence. If the employees in the plant themselves on their own motion want to start something or do something they have a perfect right to do it, but it keeps the National Labor Relations Board in its own place attending to the business of the passing on the disputes that are brought to it by disputants instead of stirring them up itself.

I hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE] will be adopted.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina to concur with an amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Virginia) there were—ayes 169, noes 11.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and eighty-seven Members are present, a quorum.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 24: On page 62, line 23, insert after the figures "": *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available to pay the salary of any person at the rate of \$4,500 per annum or more unless such person shall have been appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I send the following motion to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HARE moves that the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 24.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, this amendment was put on the bill in the Senate. It was not considered by the subcommittee of the House, the full committee, or by the House itself. It was not, as I understand it, considered by the sub-

committee of the Senate or the full committee of the Senate.

This amendment provides simply that all appointments in the Manpower Commission carrying salaries equal to or exceeding \$4,500 per year shall be confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, on the motion I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TARVER) there were—ayes 192, noes 22.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 30: Page 5, strike out lines 23, 24, and 25 and on page 66, strike out lines 1 to 15, inclusive, and insert the following:

PAR. 1. Youth work: For all expenses necessary to enable the National Youth Administration, which is hereby extended to and including June 30, 1944, under the supervision and direction of the War Manpower Commission, to provide employment and work training for young persons of the ages of 16 to 24, inclusive, on workshop and other projects approved by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission as needed in the prosecution of the war in furnishing work experience and work training preparatory to employment in occupations in which there is a present or potential shortage of labor, \$35,000,000, together with the unexpended balance of the appropriation for youth work, National Youth Administration, 1943. This appropriation shall be available for the payment of project supervisory employees; the procurement and maintenance of project facilities by contract or otherwise, including the purchase of materials, supplies, and equipment; purchase of 215 passenger-carrying automobiles; operation of resident facilities; travel expenses (not to exceed \$918,000) for travel of supervisory employees in the performance of their official duties, and transportation of trainees to, from, and between projects, including the transfer of trainees to induction projects for the purpose of placing such trainees in war production industries; and the examination of applicants for training to determine their physical fitness for subsequent employment.

PAR. 2. To provide continuance of part-time employment for needy young persons in colleges and universities, to enable such persons to continue their education, \$4,000,000, together with not to exceed \$1,000,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation for part-time employment of students, National Youth Administration, 1943.

PAR. 3. Salaries and expenses: For all expenses necessary for carrying out the general administration of the programs set forth in paragraph 1 and paragraph 2, including not to exceed \$250,000 for travel expenses, \$2,750,000.

PAR. 4. Printing and binding: For printing and binding for the National Youth Administration, \$50,000.

PAR. 5. The Administrator of the National Youth Administration shall, subject to the approval of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, fix the monthly earnings and hours of work for trainees engaged on work projects financed in whole or in part from the appropriation in paragraph 1, but such determination shall not have the effect of establishing a national average labor cost per trainee on such projects during the fiscal year 1944 substantially different from the

national average labor cost per such trainee on such projects prevailing at the close of the fiscal year 1943. The Administrator of the National Youth Administration, subject to the approval of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, is hereby authorized to fix monthly hours of work for uncompensated trainees who are employed in and whose wages are paid by private industrial concerns but who receive training through use of project facilities as authorized in paragraph 7 hereafter.

PAR. 6. Funds appropriated under paragraphs 1 and 2 shall be so apportioned and distributed over the period ending June 30, 1944, and shall be so administered during such period as to constitute the total amount that will be furnished during such period for the purposes set forth in paragraphs 1 and 2.

PAR. 7. The National Youth Administration is authorized to receive reimbursements from other Federal or non-Federal public agencies for the use of facilities and for the cost of materials, and contributions for the operation of projects from Federal or non-Federal agencies in the form of services, materials, or money; any money so received to be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States. Such contributions shall be expended or utilized as agreed upon between the contributing agency and the National Youth Administration and such reimbursements shall be available for the purposes of this appropriation. Workshop facilities and personal services of project supervisory employees of the National Youth Administration may be made available for training of individuals who are employed in and whose wages for such training are paid by private industrial concerns engaged in the production of war materials or equipment: *Provided, however*, That individuals receiving such training shall not be entitled to wage or salary payments from any funds appropriated herein.

PAR. 8. The facilities and services of the United States Employment Service of the War Manpower Commission shall be utilized wherever possible in the selection and referral of trainees for employment and work training on projects of the National Youth Administration.

PAR. 9. No alien shall be given employment or continued in employment on any work project prosecuted under the appropriation in paragraph 1 or paragraph 2 and no part of the money appropriated in paragraph 1 or paragraph 2 of paragraph 3 shall be available to pay any person who has not made or who does not make affidavit that he is a citizen of the United States, such affidavit to be considered prima facie evidence of such citizenship. This paragraph shall not apply to citizens of the Commonwealth of the Philippines or to persons who have been honorably discharged from the armed forces of the United States.

PAR. 10. No person shall be employed or retained in employment in any administrative position, or in any supervisory position on any project, and no compensated or uncompensated person shall receive assistance in the form of payments, training, or otherwise from the United States for services rendered under the National Youth Administration, under the appropriation in paragraph 1 or paragraph 2 or paragraph 3 unless such person before engaging in such employment or receiving such assistance subscribes to the following oath:

"I, A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office (or employment) on which I am

about to enter (or which I now occupy). So help me God."

PAR. 11. Compensated and uncompensated administrative and supervisory employees of the National Youth Administration, designated for the purpose by the National Youth Administrator, or his authorized representative, shall have the general powers of notaries public in the administration of oaths required by paragraphs 9 and 10 and the execution and acknowledgment of other legal instruments, and all forms of notarial acts determined by the National Youth Administrator to be necessary for the effective prosecution of the National Youth Administration programs. No fee shall be charged for oaths administered by such employees.

PAR. 12. No person who refuses prior to employment to agree that he will accept employment in industry related to national defense if and when offered in good faith shall be eligible for employment on any project of the National Youth Administration. The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply to uncompensated trainees who are employed in and who are paid by private industrial concerns.

PAR. 13. No portion of the appropriation in paragraph 1 or paragraph 2 or paragraph 3 shall be used to pay any compensation to any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States through force or violence.

PAR. 14. No portion of the appropriations in paragraph 1 or paragraph 2 or paragraph 3 shall be used to pay the compensation of any civil-service employee, except persons so appointed who are already employed by another agency of the Government and are assigned or detailed to the National Youth Administration.

PAR. 15. In carrying out the purposes of this appropriation, the National Youth Administrator, or his authorized representatives, subject to the approval of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, is authorized to accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services; to appoint and compensate officers and employees without regard to civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and to utilize, with the consent of the head of the Federal agency by which they are employed, Federal officers and employees, and with the consent of the State or local government, State and local officers and employees at such compensation as shall be determined by the National Youth Administrator to be necessary without regard to other laws governing the employment and compensation of Federal employees.

PAR. 16. Appointments in any State to Federal positions of an administrative or advisory capacity under the appropriation in paragraph 3 shall be made from among the bona fide citizens of that State so far as not inconsistent with efficient administration.

PAR. 17. In making separations from the Federal service, or furloughs without pay to last as long as 3 months, of persons employed within the District of Columbia, under the provisions of paragraph 3, the appointing power shall give preference, as nearly as good administration will warrant, in retention to appointees from States that have not received their share of appointments according to population: *Provided, however*, That soldiers and sailors and marines, the widows of such, or the wives of injured soldiers, sailors, and marines, who themselves are not qualified but whose wives are qualified to hold a position in the Government service, shall be given preference in retention, in their several grades and classes, where their ratings are good or better.

PAR. 18. The provisions of the act of February 15, 1934 (48 Stat. 351), as amended, relating to disability or death compensation

and benefits, shall apply to persons receiving compensation from the appropriation in paragraph 1 for services rendered as employees of the United States: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply in any case coming within the purview of the workmen's compensation law of any State, Territory, or possession, or in which the claimant has received or is entitled to receive similar benefits for injury or death: *Provided further*, That for carrying out the purposes of this paragraph there shall be made available to the United States Employees' Compensation Commission from the appropriation in such paragraph 1 the sum of \$86,000, or so much thereof as such Commission, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, estimates and certifies to the Secretary of the Treasury, will be necessary for such purposes.

PAR. 19. The funds appropriated by paragraph 1 hereof shall be available for emergency hospitalization and medical care, by reimbursement to Government hospitals or by contract with other public or private hospitals, in cases of critical illness or injury, of compensated trainees, who are full-time residents of projects involving the maintenance of trainees in camps or other resident facilities under the supervision of the National Youth Administration.

PAR. 20. If the death of any trainee, employed and compensated from funds provided under paragraph 1 hereof, occurs while such trainee is in transit to or in residence at such camp or other resident facility mentioned in paragraph 19 hereof, or while undergoing hospital treatment except for injuries sustained under conditions which are covered by the benefits of the United States Employees' Compensation Act as provided for in paragraph 18 hereof, the funds appropriated under paragraph 1 hereof shall be available for the payment of necessary expenses of preparation of the body for burial, interment or cremation (not to exceed a total of \$100 in any one case), and for transportation of the remains, including round-trip transportation and subsistence of an escort, to the home of the decedent, or to such other place as relatives of the decedent may designate if the distance to such other place be not greater than the distance to the home of the decedent: *Provided*, That when the expenses of the preparation and disposition of the remains, or any part of such expenses, are paid by individuals, such individuals may be reimbursed therefor.

PAR. 21. The National Youth Administrator, subject to the approval of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, is authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and pay from the appropriation in paragraph 1 any claim arising out of operations thereunder accruing after June 30, 1943, on account of damage to, or loss of, privately owned property caused by the negligence of any employee of the National Youth Administration, while acting within the scope of his employment. No claim shall be considered hereunder which is in excess of \$500 or which is not presented in writing within 1 year from the date of accrual thereof. Acceptance by a claimant of the amount allowed on account of his claim shall be deemed to be in full settlement thereof, and the action upon such claim so accepted by the claimant shall be conclusive.

PAR. 22. Any person who knowingly and with intent to defraud the United States makes any false statement in connection with any application for any project authorized in paragraph 1, or diverts, or attempts to divert, or assists in diverting, for the benefit of any person or persons not entitled thereto, any portion of the appropriations in paragraphs 1, 2, 3, or 4 or any services or real or personal property acquired thereunder, or who knowingly, by means of any fraud, force, threat, intimidation, or boy-

cott, or discrimination on account of race, religion, political affiliations, or membership in a labor organization, deprives, or attempts to deprive, or assists in depriving any person of any of the benefits to which he may be entitled under such appropriation, shall be deemed guilty of a felony and fined not more than \$2,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both. The provisions of this paragraph shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

PAR. 23. All training or educational programs other than work and training on the project location incidental to the supervision of a work program being conducted thereon for youth employed by the National Youth Administration on work projects shall be under the control and supervision of the State boards for vocational education of the several States and shall be paid for out of appropriations made to the Office of Education and expended by the States pursuant to plans submitted by State boards for vocational education and approved by the Commissioner of Education.

PAR. 24. Section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not be construed to apply to any purchase with funds appropriated for the National Youth Administration when the aggregate amount involved in such purchase does not exceed the sum of \$300.

PAR. 25. Whenever the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission shall determine that the facilities of any shop project of the National Youth Administration can contribute more effectively to the prosecution of the war if operated by another department or agency of the Government, or by another public agency, he may direct the transfer of such facilities to such department or agency.

PAR. 26. Property and facilities which are declared surplus to the needs of the program as provided in paragraph 1 may be transferred, upon such terms as may be approved by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, but without cost to the United States for transportation or otherwise, to school districts, municipalities, counties, States, or other non-Federal public agencies, without regard to other Federal law or regulation.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HARE moves that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 30 and concur in the same.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, in fairness and in justice to the House as well as to your committee a short statement should be made relative to the motion I have offered by direction of the committee.

Earlier in the year the Bureau of the Budget submitted an estimate to your subcommittee asking for an appropriation of approximately \$45,000,000 for what was known as the National Youth Administration. The item suggested made some difference in the work of the National Youth Administration to that which prevailed heretofore. Prior to that time the program had been to give needy unemployed young people work and at the same time provide a compensation for such work. The item presented to your committee eliminated the condition or provision of need and employment and provided work employment for youth from 16 to 25 years of age with a provision that if the Chairman of the Manpower Commission found it necessary he could at any time waive the maximum age limit. The subcommittee,

feeling that this was a new program, thought the matter should be sent to the House for consideration and decision. However, upon motion in the full committee this particular item was eliminated. The matter then went to the Senate and, as I understand, estimates similar to those submitted to the House subcommittee by the Bureau of the Budget were submitted to a subcommittee of the Finance Committee of the Senate. The subcommittee presented it to the full committee and the full committee eliminated the item. However, in considering the bill in the Senate the item for the National Youth Administration was inserted and sent to conference. Your conferees on the part of the House agreed that it should come to the House for consideration, and for that reason it is here today.

Mr. Speaker, I may say briefly that the work of the N. Y. A. as proposed in the bill is primarily to furnish pre-employment for persons who first agree before being employed that upon completion of their course of instruction they will be available for work in industry. That is, they will be able to go into plants now engaged in the production of war equipment.

Let me say in this connection there is not a minute of the day in which we are not reminded of the fact that our country is in a war, the greatest war of all history, a war in which we are spending millions of dollars daily in the production of munitions, materials, and equipment. We have between 12,000,000 and 15,000,000 persons directly employed in the production of equipment, and so forth, or about twice as many as are now enlisted in the armed forces to use the equipment in battle. The latter are daily insisting upon increased and more efficient equipment for use. This does not include forty to forty-five million engaged in agriculture and industries contributing indirectly to the war effort.

We have found in our production program that the preemployment training of persons going into industry contributes materially to their increased ability for production in industry. The unanimous testimony of employers and managers of industrial plants is that the training program has contributed much to the efficient and increased production in practically all of our war-production plants.

The Manpower Commission is an effort to see that the manpower of the country is utilized to the highest degree in our war effort, particularly on the home front, has recommended and adopted several different training programs for the purpose of increasing industrial efficiency and the production of war equipment. I shall attempt to analyze them but will make no effort to go into details.

First. It was soon found in our enormously increased number of workers in industry that it was not sufficient to have a thousand or twenty thousand persons physically able to work in a plant, but it was necessary to have capable, trained, and experienced overseers, foremen, or supervisors to direct this large

number of inexperienced workers. It was impossible to employ a person at the gate, send him inside of the plant, and tell him to go to work and expect him to accomplish very much unless there were someone there prepared to tell him where to work, how he should proceed, and how the work should be done. It was soon found that the number of such overseers was limited and it was necessary to begin training people for supervisory work. Therefore, a program of what is known as in-plant training was provided. Men and women of experience were employed primarily to train workers who were to direct other employees.

In the second place, it was soon discovered that with an enormous number of workers in a plant it was necessary to have an over-all training program—that is, a program that would train for coordination and correlation of the work in a plant or industry so that the entire production program would function with the least possible loss of time or friction. This type of training required persons thoroughly familiar with every operation in a plant or industry and the work was designed to train others so that they might become familiar with every operation within such plant or industry. This program was classified as apprenticeship training or apprentice training service.

In the third place, Congress appropriated last year \$100,000,000 to be used in training war-production workers through the United States Office of Education in cooperation with State and local vocational schools. This type of training was designed to give preemployment training to war production workers less than college grade, fitting them for work in industry.

In the fourth place, Congress appropriated \$25,000,000 to be used in what was considered a war-production effort to train people in rural communities through vocational schools in the construction of farm machinery and equipment and to train people how to repair and operate such machinery and equipment. This latter agency also dealt primarily with people of less than college grade.

Fifth. Another program inaugurated through the United States Office of Education in cooperation with colleges and universities was set up and designed specifically to give training of college grade in engineering, chemistry, physics, and so forth that they be better qualified to meet pressing needs in industrial plants.

Sixth. The National Youth Administration was by Executive order placed under the Manpower Commission where it was specifically designed to provide training to the unemployed youth of the country and that such training was designed specifically to meet the needs of industry. Under the proposal as submitted to the Congress the question of being unemployed was no longer a prerequisite for work training through the National Youth Administration and the proposal was to give the Chairman of the Manpower Commission the right to waive the age limit if found necessary. The outstanding difference between the train-

ing provided through the vocational schools and the National Youth Administration is that in the N. Y. A. persons are paid a certain amount while taking the training.

Mr. SHORT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I am too fond of my good friend from South Carolina to engage in an argument with him, but does not the gentleman realize that the business colleges of the country, the private schools, and even most of the public schools, are opposed to a continuance of N. Y. A. at this time?

Mr. HARE. Yes. I think the gentleman is correct in that statement, but these schools and colleges are not charged with the responsibility of furnishing munitions and equipment to our young men in the armed forces.

Mr. SHORT. I am really surprised that my good friend from South Carolina, who is so basically sound on most important questions, would favor the continuation of the N. Y. A. at this time.

Mr. HARE. I hope the gentleman understood me to say at the outset that I am going to present the facts upon which this is brought to the House, for it is his responsibility as much as mine to see that we have maximum production in our war program.

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman does not believe in it any more than I do.

Mr. HARE. That may be true, but I want to be certain not to shirk my personal responsibility.

Mr. GATHINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. GATHINGS. Does not the gentleman from South Carolina believe that the department of education of the various States can carry on this same shop work the gentleman refers to, instead of paying \$47,800,000 as carried in this bill?

Mr. HARE. I will get to that in a minute.

Mr. EATON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. EATON. Does the gentleman not know that in the industries of this country they can train these applicants for jobs a thousand times better than these starry-eyed nincompoops are doing and, in addition to that, industry has the tools and overhead and instead of wasting valuable materials as a lot of these theorists do, it saves materials? Let us be practical about this and give industry a chance.

Mr. HARE. I am not going to be drawn into an argument. I want to present the facts as they have been submitted to our committee, and you can draw your own conclusions and make your own arguments, but I will say that my conclusion from the facts submitted to us, the N. Y. A. trained and furnished more people to work in industry this past fiscal year than any other training agency of the Government.

I have told you something about in-plant training, but that is not sufficient, because it is not only necessary to have someone with experience to train a raw recruit but it is necessary to have the entire work program in a plant set up in such a way so that maximum production may be reached in the course of a day or a week, because every person in a plant is not engaged at work on the same type of machine. There are different types of machines, different types of work. It is necessary to have someone to correlate the different types of work so that they may dovetail into each other in every plant, in order that at the end of the week you will have the maximum production in that plant. We have referred to this as apprentice training service.

In addition, the Congress last year appropriated \$100,000,000 in the way of grants to the States to be used in the vocational schools where they would teach young men and young women how to operate different types of machines, so that upon the completion of their courses they would be able to go into a plant, into industry, and contribute more efficient service in the production of the war equipment so highly needed.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. Not yet. I want to get through and give you the facts and let you decide your own responsibility. I am not going to try to shoulder it for you.

In addition, by Executive order the National Youth Administration was transferred to the Manpower Commission last year; it had been engaged in furnishing employment and work to young men and young women in different parts of the country, teaching and training them by actual experience how to operate different kinds of machines, lathes, welding, the use of tools, and so forth. It was then decided that if this program was to continue these young men and young women should first agree that if they were furnished this training they would be available to go into industry and thereby meet the growing need for employees in industry.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Now will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. Not yet.

Mr. SADOWSKI. I want to help you out.

Mr. HARE. You can help me out when I get through. I shall be glad to yield the gentleman some time.

The question is this: Do we have sufficient production in this country? Is the need for workers in this country of such great importance as to justify these various types of training? If so, then we should provide for them. If not, then they should be eliminated. They are all provided for in this bill.

In other words, if the problem of production of munitions and war equipment for our armed forces is sufficiently important to justify a training program, we should provide for it. If not, we should say so and eliminate the whole thing. I will not have the time to go into de-

tail. The National Youth Administration told us 6 weeks ago, that it was training 1,000 people per day, that it was sending 500 of them into industry every day. We were told by industry that this training has proven to be very valuable in the way of increased production. If from this evidence—and it has now been available for 3 weeks—you feel that the services rendered by this agency for the promotion of our war program and our production effort are worth \$48,000,000, then you should support the amendment attached to this bill by the Senate. If you are convinced that it is not contributing value received and promoting our war effort to that extent, you should remove not only this agency but every other training agency in the same category.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. SADOWSKI. I just wanted to say in answer to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHORT]—

Mr. SHORT. I am from Missouri. Do not get it wrong.

Mr. SADOWSKI. That I thought it would be far better to put our young boys into overalls and give them something constructive to do than to have them run around in zoot suits looking for trouble.

Mr. SHORT. All right. I am glad the gentleman has his audience in the gallery to applaud him.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from South Carolina yield me a minute?

Mr. HARE. Not at this time, but shortly.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the gentleman for his boundless generosity.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I have consistently supported the National Youth Administration through these several years. I voted for it last year with the understanding that perhaps we did need to give it 1 more year to get this training program under way to supply the trained workers for war.

I have tried to watch the program in my own district. It has been a good one, but I believe it has outlived its usefulness at this time. The statistics I have seen published as to the training program for workers who have been coming into industry and the future numbers needed lead me to believe that the only thing the N. Y. A. can contribute in the future as it has been contributing in the last few months in Oklahoma is to sap from the farm and rural districts the boys who are so vitally needed to produce the food that we need to win this war.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. The gentleman has just now hit the nail on the head. The

men who are really getting the cream of the milk in the N. Y. A. are those who have employment under it and are getting good salaries out of it. They are using rubber and gasoline down in my State to beat the bushes to try to get boys off the farm into some little work that could better be learned in industry and in the public-school system of my State. The public-school officials in my State, both State, county, and municipal, are a unit against the continuation of this vermin-form appendix in our educational system.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. COX. I wonder if the gentleman would yield now just for an observation?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. COX. My record in support of the N. Y. A. is not as good as that of the gentleman. I think in the early days of the organization it did more to develop the zoot-suiters than any other outfit in our country. However, a man was brought into the organization about 2 years or more ago who cleaned it up to a very considerable extent. The program it is now carrying on, I believe, can be justified. Contrary to the attitude I have heretofore taken, I now have a friendly consideration for it and believe its existence can be justified when confined to the program it is now carrying on.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the gentleman. In conclusion, the breaking point with the N. Y. A. and myself came about a month ago when I received through the mail a very fine mimeographed letter put out by the N. Y. A. appealing to the youth of the country to take advantage of the courses that were being offered by the N. Y. A. to be of service to their Nation in industry, stressing their courses in shorthand, in bookkeeping, and other such courses. That letter happened to have been addressed to a young man who had been in the military service for 2 years.

With the colleges, universities, and business colleges stripped of students this coming fall, I hardly think it is necessary now to continue this additional set-up with a high overhead to duplicate the work that is now being efficiently handled through the public-school systems of the country by the vocational education program. This Nation needs man and woman power to win the war, but the simple existence of additional training capacity will not give us these extra hands. I am convinced that there are enough regular educational facilities, with their instructors, now available and at work under the vocational education program to satisfactorily do the job and thus save this \$40,000,000.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] 1 minute.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I am reluctant to say anything. I think we are ready to vote. No one will deny nor doubt that the N. Y. A., in the depths of the depression, with millions of men out of work, did a little good. You could not spend millions upon millions of dollars

without accidentally helping somebody a little, but the N. Y. A. did not send you, Mr. Speaker, to college, nor did it send me. We shined shoes, sold papers, fired furnaces. We were not pampered by patronizing paternalistic Federal bureaucracy that gave us a free education at the expense of surrendering our own individual freedom. This thing is silly, it is crazy, it is cockeyed. There is no excuse at this time, when our house is on fire and men are fighting and dying, to continue the N. Y. A. The business colleges and the private trade schools, and even the public schools of the country are against it. Practically every State system of education is giving vocational education, and we are now asked to tax the people to continue this extra extravagant bureau that is no longer needed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, first I want to clarify the parliamentary situation. The gentleman from South Carolina made the motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment. If that motion is voted down, and I hope it will be, then I shall move to insist upon the House amendment, which is the amendment providing for the liquidation of the N. Y. A.

There are a great many arguments which I could advance why the N. Y. A. should be discontinued; however, I have time only to comment on one phase. The question is, Do we need the trainees of the N. Y. A.? If you will turn to page 23 of part II of the War Manpower Commission hearings, you will find where Mr. McNutt testified that we had \$2,091,000 for training-within-industry training in this bill. We had last year approximately \$1,000,000 and trained 500,000 supervisors. I am assuming that if we double the money we can train 1,000,000 supervisors in 1944. The next paragraph is for the Bureau of Training, \$100,000,000. This money will provide for the pre-employment training of 800,000 and the supplemental training of 2,000,000 more in 1944. The next paragraph is for the rural training programs, providing for \$11,500,000, which was increased by the committee to \$12,500,000, and which provides for the training of 600,000 farm workers. Then we find \$30,000,000 more for short-course training, and intensive college courses for 800,000 more persons. Then if you will turn to part II of Federal Security Agency hearings, on page 157, you will find vocational educational training, \$14,000,000. We trained 2,629,000 persons last year with this amount and should train the same number this year, the appropriation being the same. This will make a total of 7,829,000 people who are going to receive some sort of training from some sort of Government agency at Government expense, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, at a total cost to the taxpayer which will exceed \$150,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, the real question is, do we want to go out and borrow \$48,000,000

from the bondholders of the Nation to continue the N. Y. A. and add 100,000 or 200,000 trainees to that program, which would add less than 2 percent trainees to the 7,829,000 we have already provided for during the coming year in this bill? That is the real issue. Last year we had up the question of the C. C. C. and we were told on the floor of this House that we could not get along without it. They said the Civilian Conservation Corps was needed for the war effort. The Secretary of War's office asked for it, The Adjutant General asked for it, as did many more. I wonder how many of the Members of this House who are here today would vote to reinstate the C. C. C. How many Members would vote to reinstate the N. Y. A. a year from now if it is abolished today?

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. Yes.

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman is from Michigan, and many of us here have visited Detroit, and it is a fact that we all know that Ford and Kaiser and these other great institutions have their own schools and are training these men.

Mr. ENGEL. Oh, I visited 47 defense plants and walked through them with the superintendents, I asked them about the N. Y. A. training, and the most that any of them said was that N. Y. A. trainees were adaptable. Here is an opportunity to save \$48,000,000, and it is up to us to do it, and no kind of argument can convince me that we should borrow \$48,000,000 to continue the N. Y. A. another year. If there is any agency in the Government that has wasted money, it is the N. Y. A. Three years ago when I went through the various departments coming under the Labor-Federal Security Agency Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, I had each department make a report to me and, among other things, list the number of cars that department had in Washington.

Mr. Aubrey Williams, as the head of the N. Y. A., reported that he had an old Pontiac, a Chevrolet, and a Ford. Imagine my surprise 2 weeks later when I found a brand new Packard twin-six four-door sedan parked by the House Office Building, with a colored chauffeur, in uniform, at the wheel and marked "National Youth Administration, Federal Security Agency."

The committee had placed a limitation of \$700 on the amount that he could spend for a car. Mr. Williams testified that he had bought this new Packard twin-six four-door sedan for \$700, and I asked him whether he also got the colored chauffeur, in uniform, at a reduced price, also.

On February 1, of this year, the University of Maryland made it compulsory for senior students to take 8 hours a week of welding during the last semester before they were graduated. Students were compelled to drop subjects which they had scheduled in a specialized course in order to make it possible to take that course in welding. The students were paid 25 cents an hour by the N. Y. A. in

spite of a provision which the committee placed into last year's bill that no one could receive N. Y. A. training unless he agreed, in writing, to accept employment in industry after the course was completed. As I recall it, there were over 400 students at the University of Maryland who took this course.

When I took the matter up with Mr. Williams, on April 9, he wrote me as follows:

I would like for you to know that this is the only university where the entire senior class has been assigned with our knowledge for such training as a part of the course of the university for which credit is given by the university toward a degree.

At the present time university and college seniors of Delaware State College for Colored Students, Rural Free Delivery, Dover, Del.; St. Cloud State Teachers College, First Avenue S., St. Cloud, Minn.; Duluth State Teachers College, Duluth, Minn.; Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass.; Prairie View State Normal and Industrial College, Prairie View, Tex.; Ranger Junior College, Marston and Pine Streets, Ranger, Tex.; and Baylor University, Waco, Tex., are receiving training for war industries in accordance with the policies as outlined in my letter to Mr. Byrd.

Mr. Williams attached to this letter a letter he had written to Mr. H. C. Byrd, president of the University of Maryland, which embodied the following conditions:

1. Only those seniors who formally apply for such training should be considered for assignment to war production training activities.
2. Approval shall be given only to those applicants who intend to use specific training in machine shop, sheet-metal and arc-welding activities in seeking employment in war industries upon their graduation from the university.
3. Approved seniors shall agree in writing to accept such employment at the time of their assignment to a war production training activity.

I wonder how many of these senior students will work in a factory?

Mr. Williams entirely disregarded the law to the effect that only trainees who agreed in writing to work in industry should be permitted to take the N. Y. A. training course.

On page 316 of the hearings, you will find a list of 11 trucks which Mr. Williams turned over to the city of Clarinda, Iowa, as a donation. While it is true the trucks were old models, I understand that they were turned in by the city for a number of good trucks.

On page 316 of the hearings, you will find the following testimony:

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Williams, will you put in the record a detailed statement as to these cars that were sold, which you told us about off the record, giving the make of the car and the year, and what you received for it?

Mr. WILLIAMS. They were simply turned over to the municipality of Clarinda, Iowa.

Mr. ENGEL. Turned over to them for nothing?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes. There was no particular value on them.

Mr. ENGEL. You gave them to the municipality?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; they were listed as junk.

Mr. ENGEL. Is that legal?

Mr. WILLIAMS. If you take them off the list it is legal.

In other words, under Mr. Williams' interpretation of the law all you have to do to give away Government property legally is to take that property "off the list." He has utterly disregarded the law and the mandate of this House together with provisions laid down in appropriation acts.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I do not suppose there is a single person on this floor who is not ready to vote on this proposition. I know I am. As the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] said, all the argument in the world would not change him. His mind is made up. I suppose there are more men on the floor of this House whose minds are made up, and all the argument in the world, regardless of how good that argument might be, would not change them at all.

All I want to say about this situation is this: I do not have any particular reputation in this House for squandering the public's money. When I have given my time to studying a proposal, as I have this one, and have gone into it as thoroughly as I have gone into this one and have visited these training centers as I have seen them operate in my own State and in other States of the Union, I am not going to change my attitude by a little emotional appeal that here is a chance to save some money.

I have not heard a single partisan in opposition to this program tell this Congress what you are going to do with the 90,000 trainees who are being trained every month by this agency. What are you going to offer to take its place? "Oh," you say, "we are going to turn them over to the vocational training schools, they will take charge of it; or we will turn them over to some other agency." I say to you that you have an operating organization. It has made many mistakes which I recognize—many mistakes. They may have spent a lot of money foolishly, but it is being condemned today, with arguments that it does not deserve.

The argument just made by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] that the N. Y. A. is stealing the boys from the farms is not justified. Do you want to know what is taking the boys from the farms in Oklahoma and all over this country? Read these ads that appear in the newspapers all over the country—ads from the shipbuilding companies and the War Manpower Commission—urging youths from 16 years of age and up to apply to the nearest employment office to be placed on the pay roll of these shipbuilding companies at from 60 to 80 and 90 cents an hour. When they are placed on the pay roll you are paying their wages out of public funds paid the contractor. Then these same shipbuilding companies turn around and turn over 40,000 of them a month to the N. Y. A. to train—the same people who are on

the pay roll of these shipbuilding and other companies. What boy or what girl on the farm or what child of high-school age—a kid of 16—would not be attracted when he reads those ads and has a chance to go and get a job that will return him 50 or 60 or 70 or 80 cents an hour while he is being trained on one of these projects?

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The N. Y. A. has been very, very enthusiastic to send the men in our area to the shipyards, when, as a matter of fact, another branch of the Government is trying very, very hard to entice labor to do other defense work in Oklahoma. I cannot see any sense in this cross-purpose.

Mr. KEEFE. I think I understand the situation of the gentleman from Oklahoma. He has always been a friend of N. Y. A., but Oklahoma is for economy now, and the gentleman is for economy.

As far as the gentleman who is addressing you is concerned, if he believes a proposal to be right and in the direct interest of winning the war, he is not going to be swayed by any specious argument or any emotional appeal.

Mr. Speaker, in my examination of the arguments pro and con, one thought has been uppermost in my mind—will the continuance of N. Y. A. help the war effort or, conversely, will the discontinuance or disruption of N. Y. A. harm the war effort? That, in my judgment, is the underlying question we must answer.

In dealing with this question, let us face the facts, and if we do, it should be clear that the central and dominating fact on the home front is that the rate of speed with which we produce the tools of war will determine whether more or less of our soldiers shall have to pay with their lives for victory. That is a hard and solemn fact, but a fixed fact that we cannot escape. Cost what it may, we must do everything that lies within our power to increase and speed production of these tools and implements of war—not next month or next year but now. If you agree with that fact, then you must also agree, for it follows inexorably, that we must not upset existing organizations which are contributing to the increase of production unless it can be shown clearly and unmistakably that such disruption will not hamper the war effort and bring closer the day of victory.

In the light of these considerations let us examine the record of N. Y. A. Briefly, the facts as I have found them are as follows:

From July 1, 1942, to March 1, 1943, the National Youth Administration gave war production training to 303,000 previously unemployed boys and girls. It is conservative to estimate that over 400,000 will have been given training in the 12-month period of fiscal year 1943 and that number, or even half that number of semiskilled workers provided for war industry cannot be discounted.

At the present about one-half of all N. Y. A. trainees are females, and the

percentage is increasing, consonant with our national needs. Boys of draft age now represent only one-third of all males and this percentage has decreased consistently and may be expected to decrease still further. Moreover, many in this draft-age group, while acceptable to industry, are not up to the physical standards of the armed services.

Over a thousand N. Y. A. trainees leave the training program every day, and a thousand other trainees, mostly without any work experience, take their places. Of those who leave, between 650 and 700 a day enter employment, the majority of them in war industries. While it is not practical to follow through on every trainee who leaves the program, there are sound reasons for assuming that many, in all probability most, of the remainder likewise find employment in war or other essential industry. Some of the trainees enter the armed services, where their N. Y. A. training in mechanics gives them an additional value.

This accomplishment has been achieved at what I believe to be a reasonable cost. To provide training for a boy or a girl for an entire month, to pay them a small wage in return for their 160 hours of work and for the goods which they produce, to provide food and lodging and limited medical care for those in resident, and to do all of this at an average cost of only \$66.91 per trainee per month is, I believe, an outstanding achievement that no one honestly can find fault with. The average period of training for each person is 7 weeks, which in terms of cost is \$108.44. These figures include all costs of every character.

As is known, but not as well known as it should be, N. Y. A. training is carried on by means of production. N. Y. A. youths learn how to produce by actually producing. The parts and articles they make are principally for the Navy, Army, and Maritime Commission. A large part of this production is of the "nuisance" order type, things made to order for a specific but limited need, which could not profitably be made by private contractors and which would have had to be made by a shore establishment or an arsenal, if they had not had the production facilities of the National Youth Administration to call upon. Other items are such as may be greatly needed to break production bottlenecks which are holding up shipments of implements of war to our soldiers. Here the saving of time is infinitely more important than the saving in cost. Any fair consideration of N. Y. A. must take account of and give credit for this production, which, though not of great proportions when measured against our gargantuan war production, still does loom large when measured against the amount of money appropriated to N. Y. A. Let me give you an idea of the extent of this production by citing the number of parts or articles made for a few Government establishments in the past 10 months:

Portsmouth Navy Yard, Portsmouth, N. Y.	1,214,313
Brooklyn Navy Yard, Brooklyn, N. Y.	406,047
Norfolk Navy Yard, Norfolk, Va.	102,731

United States Navy Coast Guard, New England	20,884
United States submarine base, Connecticut	1,384
United States Maritime Commis- sion, various shipyards	13,795
Rock Island Arsenal, Rock Island, Ill.	1,282,747
Watervliet Arsenal, Watervliet, N. Y.	8,129

Important as N. Y. A. production is, the acid test of N. Y. A.'s value is in its service to war industry. What do the managers of American industry, the men who guide the production of the tools of war think of N. Y. A.? Do they say it should be abolished?

I have made it my business to find out what industry thinks. I have examined hundreds of letters from companies producing war material and perhaps no other factor has been more important in determining my attitude toward N. Y. A. than those letters. Seldom have I known of a Government agency which received so general and so generous a tribute as is found in these letters. Here is one from the American Locomotive Co., Auburn, N. Y.:

We wish to take this opportunity of congratulating you on the fine work that the National Youth Administration has been doing in the training of girls. The girls we have employed whom you sent up here, have worked out excellent and we only wish, if it were possible, that you expand your operations so that you might be able to give us more girls between the ages of 18 and 30 of the same caliber as those whom we have received.

We find that girls who have had the National Youth Administration training are thoroughly conversant with the use of machine tools, blueprints and micrometers. This is extremely important to us.

Here is one from the Barnes-Duluth Shipbuilding Co., of Duluth, Minn.:

In the course of the past few months we have employed approximately 90 welder trainees from your training center, situated at 4832 Grand Avenue, Duluth, Minn.

We have found them to be very satisfactory and have shown that they have had exceptional training in their respective fields.

We would like to recommend that the present age limit of trainees be increased to permit the training of older people in order to meet the demands which will be brought about by the drafting of the 18- and 19-year-old men.

One from Consolidated Aircraft Corporation, Fort Worth, Tex.:

We have hired and are continuing to hire a large number of young women who have been trained by the National Youth Administration and feel that this is one of our best sources of supply.

We want to take this opportunity to express our appreciation of the fine cooperation which we have received from your organization.

Another is from the Gulf Shipbuilding Corporation, Mobile, Ala.:

We have received 726 who have come to us as trained welders, machinists, and sheet-metal workers. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you on this fact and express the appreciation of this company for the splendid work the National Youth Administration is doing in the war effort.

I would like to inform you that we have a greater need for welders, electricians, and sheet-metal workers than we do for machin-

ists. I am quite sure that we can use all of the trainees in the first three crafts that you can send us.

Also one from the Ford Instrument Co., Long Island, N. Y.:

Your training facilities, with the present restrictions, will supply us with a limited number of young people. It leaves out, however, the possibility of training the much larger number of older men and women our program requires.

We are sure that, if the restrictions as to age limit could be removed from the National Youth Administration program, your training centers could do a much bigger job in the training of many hundreds of people needed in our war industries. Your training center in Brooklyn is of unusual quality for our purposes because you have a great variety of machine-tool equipment and in larger quantities than is found in the average vocational training school. Also, you are doing production work which enables trainees to more nearly assimilate actual factory conditions.

And the Houston Shipbuilding Corporation, Houston, Tex.:

Truly the National Youth Administration here in Houston in the last year or so has been of material benefit to the Houston Shipbuilding Corporation, and I understand likewise to many other industries here. This benefit has come to us through what your organization has done for thousands of men and women in preemployment training. You have given these young people something that has made them valuable to us.

Our employment records show that approximately 75 percent of the 4,000 welders now working for us here have been given preliminary training by the National Youth Administration. The boys that we have hired from the National Youth Administration rolls on the average make better employees than welders hired from other sources. This is probably due to the fact that there has been a close cooperation between the Houston Shipbuilding Corporation and the National Youth Administration, and also that the majority of your instructors have worked for us and are familiar with our welding requirements, rules, and regulations, since these are taught to National Youth Administration trainees along with their welding training.

And from the David Bell Co., Inc., Buffalo, N. Y.:

We wish to thank you, the New York State Employment Office and the National Youth Administration project for the splendid help you have given us in securing trained help for our machine shop.

We find that it has helped speed up production by being able to have our girls trained before they are employed by us.

We ask you to pass this letter on to whom ever is responsible for the fine cooperation this plant has received. We hope that we will be able to call on you often in the future to keep our national-defense program at the peak of production.

From the Sun Shipbuilding and Dry Dock Co., Chester, Pa.:

About 2 years ago, we rented for \$1, a piece of ground to the National Youth Administration of Pennsylvania, so that they could erect a school building to train persons in different crafts. This building is located on Ninth Street and Ridley Creek, Chester, and there is some talk of closing this school.

The school has really been of great benefit to the shipyard. They have furnished to us 459 welders, 92 machinists' helpers and machine operators, and 63 sheet-metal workers from January 1, 1942, up to and including January 21, 1943. At the present time, they

have enrolled in their school 190 trainees. Of course, they not only supply employees to their shipyard but serve other industries in the locality; however, we would naturally expect to receive, as we have done in the past, 75 percent of their trainees to work in the shipyard.

As stated before, I understand that there is some question of closing this school and other schools of this type. Personally, I believe it would be a mistake to do so, as you know the shipyard is needing mechanics especially welders. Anything you can do to assist in keeping the school open will be appreciated.

And from the Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co., Wilkes-Barre, Pa.:

This National Youth Administration training has fitted these employees for duties much more advanced than is usually the case with inexperienced help.

I feel that any extension of training similar to the National Youth Administration, particularly for women or for older men, will be very beneficial to the industry and war effort of this country and should be encouraged.

And from Richmond Shipyard No. 1, Kaiser Shipbuilding Co., Richmond, Calif.:

This is to advise you that the Richmond shipyards will employ all the sheet metal, coppersmith, machinist, and welder trainees you can train.

We have found a definite shortage in skilled men within these crafts and, with the anticipation that we will hire approximately 20,000 additional employees within the next 3 to 4 months, we believe the short will become still more acute. The figure might also be enlarged by the inroads made on our personnel because of Selective Service, enlistments in the armed forces, etc.

These shipyards appreciate the work your organization has been doing in the past and thank you for your continued cooperation.

This all bears upon the question of whether or not industry wants to and is willing to do its own training. I have just cited above examples of the letters which have been received from outstanding industrial firms throughout the country in which they indicate very definitely that they cannot do the job alone. An outstanding example of this is the Henry Ford plant. You all know about the magnificent school which Henry Ford established a good many years ago and which still continues to function for the training of his skilled mechanics, his designers, his technicians. If any plant in the world has devoted interest, time, and attention to training it has been the Ford plant. However, I have here a letter written by the United States Employment Service, copies of which were sent to several hundred applicants at the Ford plant at the request of the Ford management. This letter promises very definitely to these workers that if they will take training under N. Y. A. auspices at such and such an N. Y. A. shop for so many hours, they will be assured of employment at such and such a wage in the Ford Willow Run plant, indicating quite clearly that while Henry Ford does do training, that it is done in the higher brackets of skills, that in this period of terrific demand for workers he is unable to meet the situation alone and is glad to get the help of the National Youth Administration. This same situation is duplicated nationally, in spite of all of

the quibbling you may have heard to the contrary.

Now, what are the main charges made against this agency? I think I know all of them and know them well, for I have made it my business to listen to, record, and investigate all such as have come within the range of my knowledge.

The charge has been made that the National Youth Administration is duplicating the work of the other training agencies operating under the War Manpower Commission. Let us examine these various agencies under the War Manpower Commission that are engaged in training programs for the war industries.

One of these training divisions is the Apprenticeship Training Service, which was originally organized some 10 years ago under the National Recovery Act—N. R. A.—for the purpose of promoting apprenticeships in the technical and skilled occupations on a national scale. Their job has been to promote a program of long-term indentured apprentices in the various trades. They still carry on this function under State law, and within the last year or so they have also added a side line—that of promoting the advancing worker and upgrading programs for skilled operators and production specialists. Obviously, the National Youth Administration does not enter into either of their fields. The N. Y. A. job is specifically to take the man who has never been employed and in a few weeks' or months' experience to give him those semiskills or techniques that will quickly equip him to do a war job.

Another of these training agencies is designated as training-within-industry. The purpose of this training group, as explained by its division head, is to train industrial plant foremen. Clearly there is no duplication there on the part of the National Youth Administration. They do not attempt or pretend to train foremen.

A third division of this training program of the War Manpower Commission is the E. S. M. W. T., which, gentlemen, means a branch for training in engineering, science, and management. This is a college function. Their job is to give short-term courses in science, engineering, and so forth, to men of college grade. This is purely a professional technical field; National Youth Administration does not enter into this area of training. We must bear in mind that the National Youth Administration takes a youth without work experience and gives him a job on a war-production program that gets him ready for welding, for machine shop, or sheet-metal work, and does not deal either with foremen, college engineers, or chemists.

Another training agency under the War Manpower Commission which deals particularly with the training of farm workers, is the rural work program operated under the Office of Education. This agency is engaged in the work of training farm workers. The National Youth Administration was one of those agencies which foresaw this possible shortage of

farm workers early and throughout the country rural youth under the auspices of the National Youth Administration built approximately 1,000 farm shops in connection with rural high schools for the training of farm boys in farm mechanics and all of those skills, which the boy on the farm needs. In my own State, 28 such farm shops were built. These are now being used by the Smith-Hughes and other agricultural training agencies for rural youth. In some localities, the National Youth Administration uses these farm shops, in others they are entirely under the control of vocational education. But in no case is the National Youth Administration training farm workers in the same locality and in the same school, in the same shops, where the Smith-Hughes people are operating. There is no duplication of effort.

This brings up the fifth of these training groups, which, like the Rural and the E. S. M. W. T., is a program under the Office of Education. The Office of Education designates this next program as its vocational training for war-production workers (V. T. W. P. W.) program. This is a vocational training program for industrial workers and its work has been divided into two groups. One is the supplementary training program. This is a program which is given to men in industry who, wishing to increase their skill while on the job, take night courses or courses in their off time to improve themselves in their techniques. There might be a question in some of our minds as to just where the lines of this supplementary program and the so-called upgrading program of the apprenticeship service do not cross, or parallel each other, but again the National Youth Administration does not enter into either the upgrading field for employed workers or the supplementary training for advancing workers on the vocational education program. Their work is to take the boy who does not have any skill and give him some skill.

Now we come to the second part of the V. T. W. P. W. program under the Office of Education. It is called preparatory, or preemployment training, and is operated through directives and regulations issued by the Federal Office of Education to the State vocational boards down to the local level. This preemployment training is also the field in which the National Youth Administration works.

This would be the only place in the entire War Manpower Commission where the charge of duplication might be substantiated, so far as the National Youth Administration is concerned. Now, mind you, I say "might." The N. Y. A. operates workshops for training in 556 localities. I have made a study of the locations of preparatory war-training programs in the vocational schools. I have also made a study of the locations of such programs operated by the National Youth Administration. I find that 196 of these locations are in localities in which there does not exist any war-production training within the schools. Certainly there is no possibility of dupli-

cation with existing agencies if such agencies do not exist in those localities. In 243 of the remaining locations, the war training is given under the joint auspices of the local vocational authorities and the National Youth Administration.

You will pardon me if I refer for a time to this cooperative program as carried out in my own State—Wisconsin. Wisconsin, I think most educators will admit, has carried the banner for years in this matter of vocational training. We have 47 vocational schools in the State of Wisconsin—1 in each of the major cities of 5,000 population or over. And when I say vocational schools, I mean honest-to-God vocational schools, in which there is real training given with the full support of both organized labor and of industry. I do not mean that sort of industrial arts where they make tin cans into ash trays, or broomsticks into necktie racks—I mean schools which have foundries, lathes, milling machines, patternmaking shops, and all of those things which contribute to the training of men for factories.

Wisconsin is justly proud of its vocational system. Now, I am saying that even in Wisconsin, where vocational education is widely and firmly established as a part of a highly diversified industrial State, there is need for the services of the National Youth Administration, and this is borne out by the statements of the vocational educators themselves. In my own city of Oshkosh I have the emphatic word of our vocational director, Mr. Bleyer, that there is the closest cooperation between him and the N. Y. A. officials, and that he has assisted in the training of hundreds of youth, who, without the cooperation of the National Youth Administration, could not have been trained.

There would seem to be complete coverage by the 47 vocational schools in Wisconsin; yet there are 5 communities in Wisconsin in which the National Youth Administration operates training programs where there are no vocational schools. In 2 cities these shops are 80 miles from the nearest vocational school—1 at Plattville and 1 at St. Croix Falls.

Now, take Milwaukee. You probably have heard of the Milwaukee Vocational School, the largest school of its kind in the world. Educators from all parts of the country, and of the world, have visited the Milwaukee Vocational School; yet here are letters from two nationally known Milwaukee industrialists—the Kearney-Trecher Co., which makes the Milwaukee milling machine; and Allis-Chalmers. Understand, too, gentlemen, that both of these plants, these huge, nationally known firms, have training programs of their own—apprenticeship programs. They utilize the Milwaukee Vocational School wherever possible—and still these firms come out definitely and say that in this all-out war effort they are grateful for, and in need of, every possible training assistance that can be had, and they particularly mention the services of the National Youth Administration.

Now, there is no doubt that in some of the 48 States there are certain locations in which both the vocational schools and the National Youth Administration can and do operate separately, but that does not mean duplication of effort. In fact, it may mean absolute integration and cooperation of effort for the purpose of getting the greatest number of sorely needed workers for war industry. The field is wide. The Training Bureau of the War Manpower Commission has as its chief job the coordination of all of these training facilities, and you can readily see that duplication of effort is one of the things with which they would be most concerned.

There are several functions which the National Youth Administration is carrying on which no other agency is organized to do. Forty percent of the N. Y. A.'s program is carried on through resident centers, which because of local restrictions and local laws and conditions, the schools or other local agencies are not equipped to operate. These resident centers are established in places where training is not available, and are used to house and subsidize you who come from areas where there is no training opportunity.

Another valuable asset which is peculiar to the National Youth Administration is its ability to shift workers from a labor supply area to a labor shortage area. For example, the National Youth Administration has trained and transferred into the New England States over 7,000 workers; into the Seattle area over 6,000 workers for aircraft and ship workers. They are sending into the submarine base at Hunter's Point, Calif., 100 marine electricians and welders per month, and so forth.

Another valuable quality which the N. Y. A. program possesses in a high degree is its flexibility, its mobility, its ability to set up quickly and effectively a shop-training program in spots where the training is most needed. For example, the Kaiser Yards at Richmond, Calif. The N. Y. A. resident training center and welding facilities are located immediately adjacent to the Kaiser yard. And over a period of months the National Youth Administration has trained and inducted into the Kaiser yard trained welders. So effective is this training that the Kaiser firm in one of the recent issues of their house organ *Fore N'aft*, devoted two full pages to a commendatory description of the N. Y. A. training program for their shop. The National Youth Administration is so set up that it can and does move machines, shops, buildings, across State lines, across regional lines, from city to city, wherever the War Manpower Commission determines the training is most needed. It is not bound, as are the local training agencies, by any traditional restrictions of law or regulation, institutional or jurisdictional restraints.

In the past year, this agency moved 10,500, or more than 25 percent of its work stations to new locations, as the urgency of training needs developed in various parts of the country. It has proved to be the only training agency that is capable of rapidly moving and

setting up its facilities to meet immediate needs.

The second charge is that N. Y. A. costs are higher than those of other agencies. I have shown previously at what low cost per trainee the National Youth Administration operates. At this point I should like to pursue the matter a little further, for in the Report of the Joint Committee there appears a comparison of the costs of the National Youth Administration with the costs of the Office of Education. Four cost items are there compared although it is admitted in the report that the data for the Office of Education are incomplete. To substantiate this statement, I quote from the report itself:

It must be borne in mind that the Office of Education does not meet all the expenses borne by the National Youth Administration. The cost of equipment, rent, and instruction is frequently taken care of by arrangement with school authorities.

What possible value such admittedly lopsided comparisons can have is beyond my power to imagine unless it be intended to cast an odious reflection upon one of the agencies, for if in fairness we take those items in the record that are truly comparable, an entirely different story is revealed. The salaries of the N. Y. A. are \$13.75 against \$16.60 for the Office of Education; other costs are \$12.48 for the N. Y. A. and \$8.78 for the Office of Education. Now, if we add the figures for each agency we find that the N. Y. A. costs for the two items under consideration are \$26.23, whereas the Office of Education cost figures are \$25.38, a total difference of 85 cents.

Nor does this tell the whole story, for everyone recognizes the fact that in the production program carried on by the National Youth Administration and in the N. Y. A. trainee-transfer system there are certain costs which N. Y. A. properly and necessarily sustains which are not incurred by the Office of Education. It is not practical to attempt to assess the amount which these costs are of the total of other costs, but it is certainly reasonable to assume that if these costs were abstracted then it might very well be that the comparison of costs would be considerably in favor of the National Youth Administration.

As I stated at the outset, I have taken the time and the trouble to examine very closely into the administration of N. Y. A. affairs and it is my considered judgment that the program is efficiently administered and that on the score of costs it compares favorably with any Government agency.

Another criticism made of the National Youth Administration is that it has thousands of idle work stations. The apparent purpose of this criticism is to make it appear that N. Y. A. is grossly inefficient in the use which it makes of the equipment at its disposal. How far this is from the truth the record itself very clearly reveals. When Mr. Williams appeared before the committee he stated that N. Y. A. had 39,000 work stations in active use. At this point the chairman of the committee interposed that the Budget Bureau testified there were 55,000 work stations of which 16,000

were not in use. Asked about these 16,000 work stations, Mr. Williams stated that some were in warehouses and some were on loan to other agencies. Mr. Williams was then requested to provide a statement for the committee concerning the precise status of the 16,000 work stations in question. That statement, which is part of the record, shows that 4,675 work stations were on loan to other agencies; 3,260 work stations had been transferred to other agencies, 6,652 work stations had been or were in process of being declared surplus for disposal by the Treasury, and only 2,227 of the 16,314 work stations were held in warehouses for the use of the National Youth Administration. Now let me again point out the fact that N. Y. A. is constantly opening or closing training shops as the changing manpower needs of industry and the supply of trainees available at a given point may dictate.

In this regard, let me point out that when the National Youth Administration appeared before the Appropriations Committee last year, they agreed that with certain funds they could utilize their training stations to train 400,000 during the year 1942-43. The records show that they fulfilled this agreement, and will have actually trained some 20,000 more than this number during the fiscal year.

Actually, the National Youth Administration has made extremely efficient use of its machines. Here, for example, is the record for the month of March of this year. There were 9,756 machine-shop stations available during the month of March, upon which 17,583 youths were employed. This means that these machine-shop stations throughout the country averaged nearly 16 hours of operation out of the 24 hours daily, which I assure you is a good record.

I wish now to discuss specifically the report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, in which we find all of the arguments anyone has ever advanced against the N. Y. A. These are summed up in the conclusions found at the end of the report proper. I propose to consider each of these conclusions separately and in the same order as they appear in the report. The first and second conclusions, having to do with duplication and cost, I have mentioned previously.

The third conclusion contains the charge that N. Y. A. enrollment has fallen off markedly, while the number of females is rapidly overtaking the number of males. It is true, as I pointed out earlier, that the number of females on the program is increasing, for which development N. Y. A. should certainly receive praise rather than blame. Insofar as the other charge in this conclusion is concerned, the record does not bear out the contention of a marked falling off in trainees. In the report the number of trainees on the defense training program, the forerunner of the present war-production training program, is shown as 57,297 on July 30, 1941. For November 25, 1942, the comparable figure, shown in the report, is 53,603. The figure as of May 26, 1943, not shown in the report but easily verifiable, is

52,721. The facts here given speak for themselves.

The fourth conclusion states that N. Y. A. has been forced to depend more and more on boys beneath the draft age of 18 for its male trainees. In view of the large number of boys taken into the armed services, it should hardly cause surprise that this should be so, but why it should be held to the discredit of N. Y. A. is beyond my power to imagine.

The fifth conclusion states that the equipment of N. Y. A. is not being utilized to an extent commensurate with satisfactory results. That it is not being utilized to full capacity is well known, and it was Mr. Williams who first brought that fact to the attention of Congress. Within the financial, age, and other limitations placed upon the N. Y. A. by Congress, I think the utilization of N. Y. A. equipment has been exceedingly satisfactory.

The sixth conclusion is to the effect that only 50 percent of the youth trained by the National Youth Administration use their skills in war industry. Assuming for a moment that the statement is accurate, which I do not admit, I should like to ask whether 200,000 trained youth provided for war industries is not in itself a record to be proud of. However, the figure takes no account of those who go into other essential industry, such as those industries concerned with the maintenance of the home front. It is my considered judgment that at least 80 percent of N. Y. A. trainees use their training in a way that is of great benefit to the war effort, to essential industry, and to government.

The final conclusion is that N. Y. A. has created fear in educational circles of centralized control of all education.

I am particularly glad to discuss this charge, for it is precisely because I am unalterably opposed to a federally controlled or operated system of education that I have supported the National Youth Administration. There is need now, and doubtless will be greater need in the foreseeable future, for an agency whose peculiar function it is to provide work and training to young people who are ready to enter industry but who are without work experience. This need may last for some time or it may disappear overnight. Therefore what we do as a Federal Government should be of a nature that can be quickly ended if and when its need ceases to exist. If we were to place this work within the framework of the schools, every man in this House knows we should be actually committing this Government to the nationalization of education.

We have in the National Youth Administration a structure recognized as temporary, and even if we should ask for and secure legislation, it would still be temporary, and not an integral part of the regular continuing departments and functions of the Federal Government.

Those who are asking Congress to abolish this agency because it is likely to become a Federal educational agency are the very same people who are asking Congress to expand Federal appropria-

tions for the admitted purpose of putting the Federal Government deeper and deeper in the business of supervising and financing our educational system. It is they—the very same ones who denounce the National Youth Administration—who are working night and day to put the educational system under the control of the Federal Government.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I have one of these training centers in my own home town. For a space of four blocks in either direction from that center property values have been lowered. They do not have a reputation in my territory of turning out the best of mechanics. They employ solicitors to go around to the boys and girls, men and women who are taking regular vocational training, which costs about one-tenth as much under the Bureau of Education and under the State authorities, and they are soliciting with paid solicitors, furnished with automobiles running around, urging these men and women to leave the State training schools that are paid for by us but do not cost as much, to come to this N. Y. A. private boarding school.

Now, maybe that is the thing to do. The N. Y. A., according to Mr. Williams, at page 373 of the hearings, proposes to train with \$49,000,000, 58,000 trainees. The other cost, with about \$100,000,000, trains 880,000. In other words, this N. Y. A. training program as a whole—that is about all they do—will cost us approximately \$880 per trainee as against \$125 for the regular outfit that goes through our schools.

In my territory, out of their private boarding school, we see a white boy and a black girl come out, and a black boy and a white girl come out together. The entire program has been demoralizing. It has been demoralizing all the way through.

I do not think that we ought to permit it to continue any longer. I hope the House will vote against the motion to recede and concur and get rid of the expenditure of \$49,000,000. It is time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], in the full Committee on Appropriations, made a very forceful statement concerning the project at Auburn, his home town, relative to the Negroes and whites slipping around together; Negro girls and white boys, and white girls and negro boys. When this bill was presented to the House I addressed the House and invited the gentleman to make a statement for the record, since he had not appeared before the subcommittee.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Not just at this time. The gentleman did not appear before

the subcommittee and give it the benefit of the alleged information, and, of course, there was no opportunity to read the charge he made before the full committee because it was not made of record.

The gentleman today has made some slight reference to the subject matter which he discussed more fully before the full committee and upon which he based a major portion of his opposition when he was before the full committee.

I want to ask the gentleman from New York now, before he questions me, whether he is acquainted with one William C. Bush, Republican county committeeman, of his home city of Auburn, N. Y.

Mr. TABER. Who?

Mr. TARVER. William C. Bush, Republican county committeeman, of the gentleman's home city of Auburn.

Mr. TABER. I did not know there was such a person.

Mr. TARVER. He signs his name as "William C. Bush, Republican county committeeman," and in a telegram from Auburn, N. Y., dated June 15, 1943, he states:

Have positive knowledge value of Auburn trained National Youth Administration youth to war industry. Youth being placed very important work. Social activities of youth above reproach and any statement to the contrary to facts evidence unfamiliarity with Auburn National Youth Administration center.

May I ask the gentleman if his home town is Auburn, N. Y.?

Mr. TABER. It is.

Mr. TARVER. Does he know one Charles D. Osborne, publisher of the Citizens Advertiser?

Mr. TABER. I do.

Mr. TARVER. Is he a reputable man?

Mr. TABER. Well, that depends.

Mr. TARVER. I know that depends on whether he agrees with the gentleman or not.

Mr. TABER. No; it depends on whether he is telling the truth or not.

Mr. TARVER. Well, of course, he would not agree with the gentleman under the gentleman's construction of the facts, so he would not be telling the truth. A telegram from this gentleman states:

Concerning the National Youth Administration, Auburn, as a fine example of furthering war effort: Would ask how much Mr. TABER knows of local operations and question whether he has ever visited or investigated local center for facts of accomplishments.

May I ask the gentleman if he ever visited the N. Y. A. center at Auburn?

Mr. TABER. Certainly.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman seems to doubt that the gentleman from New York has done so.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman from Georgia is cluttering the Record up with a lot of stuff that has no basis. I have told the House what I have seen with mine own eyes and heard with mine own ears.

Mr. TARVER. Does the gentleman from New York know the pastor of the First Methodist Church, of Auburn, N. Y.?

Mr. TABER. I will have to admit that I do not.

Mr. TARVER. Well, perhaps the gentleman is better known to the pastor than the pastor is known to the gentleman.

The pastor, at least the gentleman who signs himself as the pastor of the First Methodist Church in Auburn, N. Y., has sent a telegram regarding charges made by the gentleman against the N. Y. A. center at that place, in which he says:

Have found no untoward mingling of races at Auburn, N. Y., center speaking from personal observation.

WARREN G. ODOR,
Pastor, First Methodist Church.

And the gentleman is not acquainted with him?

Mr. TABER. I have only told what I saw with my own eyes.

Mr. TARVER. Here is a sheaf of telegrams from outraged citizens from the gentleman's home city of Auburn, N. Y. I will not have the time to read them, but they all complain of the gentleman's criticism of the Auburn N. Y. A. center and say that his criticisms were entirely without facts and basis.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Not at this time.

There are a lot of people, Mr. Speaker, who want to destroy everything that has been started by this administration, who want to destroy the H. O. L. C., the C. C. C., and everything else, including the N. Y. A., that had its birth during the years of this administration.

The gentleman from Michigan is proud of having destroyed the C. C. C. I do not think the future will show that he did a very good job as to that. I think the future will show that there has been a tremendous waste of Government property and dissipation of assets of the C. C. C. in not keeping them for use in the emergency that will undoubtedly follow this war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. HARE. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, it is not possible to discuss the matter under limited debate which prevails here, but I do want to say that in my judgment this organization has shown its usefulness in this time of national emergency and that it would be a tragic thing to abolish it as is insisted should be done by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

I sincerely hope that the motion of the chairman to recede and concur in the Senate amendment will be adopted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the gentleman from Wisconsin and others that this is not going to be an emotional appeal; I am going to stick to facts. The preceding speaker went out of his way to read some telegrams in his unwarranted attack on the gentleman from New York, Mr. TABER. Now, if you want some facts in

connection with the N. Y. A. program I will give them to you in just a few minutes. I also have some telegrams. Last year the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and I spent three weeks on the Pacific coast investigating private shipyards building ships for the Navy. We made a thorough inquiry into the training program in each of those shipyards, inquired into just how much the N. Y. A. was worth. In our report, which was filed with the full Committee on Naval Affairs on February 15, you will find the following quotation:

Your committee considered the various types of training, such as the so-called public-school program and the National Youth Administration program, both of which were found to be unsatisfactory. The in-plant training of new employees, conducted by a majority of the shipyards, appears to be the most satisfactory method.

That was our reference to it in the report. After all the propaganda that has been spread around by N. Y. A. I thought it best to do a little further investigating to see what had happened in the 6 months which have elapsed since we looked into that situation on the Pacific coast. I wired the naval supervisors of shipbuilding in each of the three Pacific coast naval districts, and for your information and for the information of the gentleman from Georgia who wants facts, I received from the Seattle supervisor of shipbuilding the following wire:

National Youth Administration training program in this area understood to be on relatively small scale and has not heretofore been brought to attention this office in any way. A check of experience at principal shipyards here shows that only a few hundred new employees, principally welders, were received from this training program during the past year.

Mind you, that is the Seattle area where there are thousands and thousands of shipyard workers.

I now read another telegram from the naval supervisor of shipbuilding in the eleventh district, the Los Angeles area:

My opinion is that for new naval ship construction the National Youth Administration program has proved to be of little if any value and is not now in this area a factor in training for ship construction.

That from the supervisor of shipbuilding in the eleventh naval district.

I have one more from the San Francisco Bay area, the largest shipbuilding area on the Pacific coast, again from the naval supervisor of shipbuilding:

Re your inquiry effectiveness of National Youth Administration training program, this agency has not been of any material assistance in either preemployment or advanced shipbuilding training programs in this area. Principal cause for lack of effectiveness due to policy of agency that program must be built around production, which precluded more general utilization of their excellent equipment as was necessary in shipbuilding training programs. In comparing results of National Youth Administration limited training program and cost of same with that of State-financed preemployment training, am of opinion National Youth Administration program very much more extravagant.

That is signed by the supervisor of naval shipbuilding in the twelfth naval district.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Not now. I want to say this to the gentleman, whom I know is interested in education, that in San Jose, Calif., one of the leading educators, one of the finest superintendents of education in the State of California, had this to say of N. Y. A. in that section:

Before the war, over in the technical high school we had as fine a sheet-metal lay-out as any school ever had, and an excellent mill cabinet shop, but I'll be damned if the National Youth Administration didn't come to San Jose and, under the rottenest teachers that I ever saw in my life, set up two classes in sheet metal and mill cabinet. I got hold of the actual figures for running those classes, and the costs of instruction, materials, and overhead were exactly four times our costs. In addition to that they paid the kids to go to school.

We had a meeting with the labor leaders in San Jose, and they put the heat on and put it on hard. There isn't a labor union in town that won't fight the National Youth Administration. There are practically 100 percent of the school people who will fight the National Youth Administration.

If we want a Federal school system supported entirely by Federal funds and run by the New Deal gang, just give them money enough to run this National Youth Administration program.

That letter is signed by the city superintendent of schools, who is my good personal friend and whose opinion I value highly.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Not just now; I have some more facts to give the gentleman from Georgia and my colleague from California.

In addition to the wires received from the naval supervisors of shipbuilding on the Pacific coast, I wired to several of the leading shipyards on the Pacific coast, the yards that are actually engaged in the production of ships for our Navy and for the Maritime Commission. I am going to place them in the Record. I got exactly the same type of replies from them. I asked those shipyards what in their opinion was the value of the N. Y. A. training program as far as ship construction was concerned, and in each instance they said it was of little or no value and had proven entirely unsatisfactory.

Here are the wires. Read them yourselves and then try and prove that the N. Y. A. training program is essential to the war production effort:

Since March 1942 we have been receiving very few people from National Youth Administration. For last 6 months out of a total of 6,000 people hired, 290 came from National Youth Administration. I feel that it is probably a good thing during a depression, but not necessary at this time. Best wishes.

ASSOCIATED SHIPBUILDERS,
Seattle, Wash.

We believe National Youth Administration has largely duplicated existing public trade schools and the result has been negligible as far as shipbuilding is concerned.

PRESIDENT, SEATTLE-TACOMA
SHIPBUILDING CORPORATION,
Seattle, Wash.

The Seattle-Tacoma Shipbuilding Corporation is building large numbers of destroyers and auxiliary carriers for the Navy.

Regret that I am unable to give you any information on the National Youth Administration training program as a whole. I am not familiar with their activities. A survey of our employment records shows that approximately 1.3 percent of our employees have at some time attended National Youth Administration schools. This would indicate that the National Youth Administration training program has been of little value to this plant. Regards.

LAKE WASHINGTON SHIPYARDS,
Houghton, Wash.

Now we move farther south:

For your information as to value of National Youth Administration training program as far as our operations are concerned I do not know of any benefits to our program.

MOORE DRYDOCK CO.,
Oakland, Calif.

The Moore yard is one of the largest in the San Francisco Bay area and employs in the neighborhood of 40,000 men.

The National Youth Administration training program is an unknown quantity to us and has not contributed anything constructive so far as we know. It is my opinion that our present training program sponsored by city, State, and the Government agencies we are under contract to are quite sufficient and much more desirable, and anything done by the National Youth Administration would only tend to introduce undesirable elements.

VICE PRESIDENT, WESTERN PIPE & STEEL,
South San Francisco, Calif.

Now from Los Angeles:

This will acknowledge receipt of your telegram of June 24 relative to our experience with the National Youth Administration training program.

The National Youth Administration has never attempted to utilize this yard for their training purposes and we can offer no comment as to whether or not it has been beneficial in other yards in this area.

LOS ANGELES SHIPBUILDING &
DRYDOCK CORPORATION.

Mr. Speaker, these are factual statements that I have received from reputable shipbuilding companies on the Pacific coast within the last week. Let us blow aside the smoke screen of nonexpediability which the N. Y. A. has drawn around itself and look at the facts.

It seems to me it boils down to this: How long are we going to keep these "gimme" boys on the pay roll down there? We will never have a better chance than we have right now to give the "gimme" boys the gate. The Senate amendment should be voted down.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND].

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I have only 2 minutes because I feel very strongly about this particular problem. Most of my life work has been spent in working with young people. I have seen the N. Y. A. go through its student-training program, through the days of the emergency and, now, in my opinion, it is making a very real contribution to the war effort. I hope very sincerely that we decide this not on the basis of personal or political bias, but on

the basis of sincere judgment. The question is whether or not the Congress is going to tell the American people that it places the men and women of this country at least on a par with the spending of money. I think that is one of the basic issues involved.

I am sorry that my colleague from California did not yield because I had a couple of figures I would like to have given him. I am wondering if he is aware of the fact that the Hunter's Point Shipbuilding Co., at San Francisco, Calif., has asked the National Youth Administration for 200 of its trained employees every month during the coming year? I am wondering if he is aware of the fact that at the present time the Kaiser shipyards at Richmond, Calif., is employing 1,600 trained welders taken from the ranks of the National Youth Administration?

I realize that there is considerable controversy over the National Youth Administration on the part of educational leaders. Their opinion is far from being unanimous. I have here a letter signed by 15 of the leading educators of America stating that the N. Y. A. has operated its out-of-school program principally in rural areas where vocational-school-training facilities are not generally available. At present 1,000 young people are made available daily for the Victory program. This letter states further that no matter whether one believes in the N. Y. A. or its structure, the need for trained people will be so great next year that any agency which trains for war production or aids students to continue essential education must not be abandoned at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, in the brief time allotted me, may I call attention especially to one phase of this N. Y. A. program. Time does not permit me to discuss in detail the activities of that organization. Let me say at the outset that those of you who are so determined to eliminate the N. Y. A. and who are using that word "economy" as the excuse for so doing will have a real opportunity to vote for economy in a few minutes when I bring in a conference report on the annual Interior Department appropriation bill. We had nearly 6 weeks' hearings on that bill and your House committee brought that measure to this House reduced 60 percent below what it took to operate this same Department during the current year. This is not the time to discuss what happened to the Interior bill at the other end of the Capitol. Suffice to say that my committee is battling to slash and save every dollar humanly possible. My record of over 16 years for rigid economy in government speaks for itself.

Mr. Speaker, I now wish to direct my remarks to the shops program of the National Youth Administration. I take the position that if the N. Y. A. is not vitally essential to the war effort, then let us kick it all out. That yardstick should apply not only to the N. Y. A. but

to all other agencies and set-ups. But on the other hand, if N. Y. A. is actually training thousands of young men and women to do vital jobs in connection with the war effort, it would be utterly absurd to abolish it now when industries are crying for trained workers in so many fields of endeavor.

Then I submit in all candor that it is fair to say that the National Youth Administration should be continued for one reason and one reason only, because of the service which this agency is rendering and is in a position to further render in the war. I have here some official figures. The gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] in his blast at the N. Y. A. a few moments ago said: "Let us stick to the facts." Here are some facts worth considering: Last year the N. Y. A. trained over 400,000 young men and women in skilled war-production work. Each 7 to 8 weeks during the year it turned out 16,000 welders, 24,000 machine operators, 11,000 aircraft and other sheet-metal workers, 6,500 radio assembly workers, and so forth. It has, in fact, been turning out these persons at the rate of more than 1,000 a day during the past year, and, at the present moment, even with the limitations under which it works, this number is increasing each week.

It was able, by virtue of having to do this, to put together a training structure made up of 1,500 shops, located in 510 different communities, of 40,000 work stations with 4,300 experienced supervisors—and a capacity to train 500,000 to 600,000 war-production workers within the next year. Since it has been suggested Members stick to the facts, let me say these are hard, cold facts that cannot be successfully controverted. Yet, this is the program we are called upon today to dismantle and destroy. It just does not make sense.

As Members well know, this Congress has just approved a plane construction program never before dreamed of in this or any other country. Regardless of what we may do, we will fall far short of the need for trained, skilled workers. So it is no answer to say that other agencies can train all of the needed workers. The N. Y. A. is, of course, not supposed to make critical materials for the war effort in mass production. It is strictly a training program, yet its 1,500 well-equipped shops are being called upon in many instances to make critical materials for many of the shipyards of the country. In the outside lobby of the House is a display of several specimens made in N. Y. A. shops throughout the entire country. I have several small gadgets, cogs, tools, and other materials turned out by these shops for the war effort. I hold in my hand a small piece of steel scrap. It was sent to the N. Y. A. with the urgent request that 10-millimeter bullets be made therefrom in considerable quantities. Here is the finished bullet made by N. Y. A. It might be a shock to some of you critics to learn how many such critically important war materials are now being turned out by the N. Y. A. boys and girls.

I am very proud of those shops and what they are actually doing. I recently

visited one of the best N. Y. A. shops in my State and was really amazed at the excellent training it is giving. For example, it is teaching a lot of young girls and women to become welders. It is of course easy to scoff and jest, but I say to you in all seriousness that the determination of some to stop this valuable training program, merely because it is a part of the New Deal which some seem so bent on destroying, is no jesting matter. A visit to one of those modern, well-equipped N. Y. A. shops would open your eyes. For instance, I hold here a small delicate cog made by the N. Y. A., the material of which cost about 6 cents, so I am told. It cannot be bought on the open market.

It is very vitally important to the war effort and the trained force of N. Y. A. is prepared to turn them out in large numbers on short notice. Certainly this part of the N. Y. A. can amply justify its existence. Then again, I hold here what is called a cross head. The Brooklyn Navy Yard needs them now, and N. Y. A. is supplying them promptly. If the N. Y. A. does not make these critical parts and is not permitted to train young men and women to make them then a tremendous job is going to fall elsewhere.

I do not pretend to say that the N. Y. A. has not made mistakes, but as the gentleman from Georgia said awhile ago, it has eliminated in a large measure those things for which it was justly criticized, and is now rendering a real worth-while service to the all-important program of winning the war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I was in very serious doubt as to how I was going to vote on this matter until I reviewed the facts as to the operations of the N. Y. A. in my own home city of Boston. Let me give you these figures:

In the N. Y. A. centers there are 43 work stations for machines with 129 possible enrollments and 20 enrollees. In the vocational schools there are 480 work stations, with 1,440 possible enrollments and 598 pupils.

In the N. Y. A. centers there are 34 work stations for welding, with 102 possible enrollments and only 30 students, on the average. In the vocational-school system there are 116 work stations, with 348 possible enrollments and 94 students actually at work.

You can go through the entire list, covering every industrial city in the State of Massachusetts, and you will get exactly the same type of showing.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, just a few days ago this House voted seventy-one and one-half billion dollars for our Army. A tremendous sum of money that staggers the imagination. But there was scarcely a dissenting vote in the entire body to the appropriation of this gigantic amount. Why should there be? Is there a single Member of this House who would not

lend his most vigorous support to any measure serving to strengthen our boys out there on the battle fronts? Whether it be with MacArthur, in Guadalcanal or Eisenhower in north Africa or Stilwell in China, our boys out there are offering their lives that democracy may live. Our job, here, back home, is to give them every support, every encouragement, every material assistance that they need. And we will do just that. If need be they can have more and more until the would-be world dictators are smashed.

But the support that our fighting men need involves more than money. I perhaps most important of all, they need bullets, guns, planes, ships, tanks, jeeps, and thousands of other items of fighting equipment. We have appropriated the money to buy them. That is not enough. We have got to see to it that they are made and delivered and that the trained manpower is available to produce them. And no single item is more important in making fighting equipment than skilled workmen. It does not require just men and women. It requires men and women whose hands are trained to operate turret lathes, drill presses, shapers, planers, and dozens of other complicated pieces of machinery.

There is now pending before this House legislation continuing an agency which has for the past several years been backing up our fighting men. Young men, too young to serve in the armed forces; young men unable to serve because of physical disabilities; young girls; sisters and wives of men in the fighting services; all have been trained by this agency to back up our soldiers and sailors. Their unskilled hands have been trained to operate the lathes and shapers, the welding equipment, the micrometers and tools out of which are forged guns and planes and ships.

It is now our responsibility to pass on the bill calling for the continuation of the National Youth Administration. We have voted the \$71,500,000,000 to equip our fighting men. Will we now view favorably an appropriation to maintain the N. Y. A. program of providing the skilled hands without which our \$71,500,000,000 appropriation for equipment might become so much paper? The request of the N. Y. A. is for a sum of money which is six one-hundredths of 1 percent of the amount recently appropriated to the Army. The smallness of the sum alone does not warrant its passage. It is rather the fact that through such a comparatively small amount of money over a quarter of a million new trained war workers will be added during this fiscal year to our war-production lines that justifies our favorable consideration.

I have had the pleasure of visiting those N. Y. A. training units located in the district which I have the honor to represent. I have seen the shops operating 24 hours per day in their production of new war workers. I have seen young boys and girls walk into the shops of Lawrence and Lynn, timid, ill at ease, afraid of the machines, lacking the most elementary knowledge of shop work. I have seen them labor 8 hours per day

over their lathes and millers and planers under the careful supervision of their veteran supervisors. I have seen after the first month the development of confidence, the appearance of the shop-wise attitude, the pride in workmanship, and the general growth of self-reliance. I have seen at the end of the second month the new worker, trained and straining at the leash to get out into a war job. I have seen them leave for jobs in war plants. And I have seen the letters which the war plants have poured into my office commending the efficiency and thoroughness of the N. Y. A. training in these shops.

I have seen all of these things, and I can think of no greater material assistance to our fighting boys at the front than the work of the N. Y. A. in providing the skilled hands which make the guns that drove the Germans out of north Africa and the Japs out of the Aleutians. They are even now, while receiving this training, turning out essential submarine parts in all of these shops for the United States Navy. I know boys and girls from my district who are now working in the Remington Arms plant in Lowell, at General Electric in Lynn, at the Portsmouth Navy Yard, N. H., and at the Boston Navy Yard. At the Remington plant in Lowell, they are turning out guns and ammunition; at the General Electric plant in Lynn they are turning out every conceivable type of war equipment; and at the navy yards they are working on airplane carriers, destroyers, and battleships. They are backing up the boys at the front because the N. Y. A. took them in hand and gave to them the skills and training necessary to make the fighting equipment. In Lawrence, since the start of the fiscal year, more than 600 young boys and girls have passed through the N. Y. A. training unit to enter the war factories and in Lynn the figure exceeds 500.

This is backing up our fighting men. This is giving them the support that they need. This is giving them the stuff with which to give us another Midway victory, another Tunisian conquest, and another series of raids on Berlin and Tokyo. Other steps are necessary to back up our loved ones who are doing the fighting for us. But let us take them one by one. We have appropriated a tremendous sum of money that the Army may purchase every bit of fighting equipment needed. Is it not in order to appropriate this comparatively minor sum that the hands required to make this fighting equipment may be trained?

It is my intent to vote for the N. Y. A. appropriation. I shall vote for it with the same purpose and determination with which I voted for the \$71,500,000,000 Army appropriation. Because I know each is dependent upon the other. Because I know that without the skilled workers to make the goods, the Army will not be able to spend its money for the purpose intended. And, it is my sincere conviction that this House, voting on the N. Y. A. bill with the same patriotism, impartiality, and nonpartisanship with which it voted for the Army bill, will give

to the N. Y. A. the same overwhelming support that we have and shall continue to give to any and all measures designed to strengthen our fighting men.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the salvation of our Government and the perpetuity of our institutions now unfortunately depend upon our production program. In my opinion the National Youth Administration has made a great contribution to that program. Many efforts have been made to minimize the contribution which National Youth Administration has made to the prosecution of the war effort. The training of more than a half million boys and girls in mechanical skills, which have been of inestimable value to industry in its effort to meet the enormous production schedules which have been set and which of necessity must be met, is a contribution which is well worth while. Certainly those in charge of the program have made mistakes. Certainly the program has not been in all respects a complete success, and the officers of the agency have not done all things well, but there never was a time in the history of America when there was a greater need for skilled workmen, and this peacetime agency quickly embarked upon a wartime program, and thousands of young men and women have been trained to do vital war work. Our manpower shortage will no doubt become more acute if this war continues. There is still a great shortage of skilled workmen, and there is still a crying need for more training. The great crisis is upon us and if we interfere with or cripple this agency of the Government, we do so at our peril.

I am advised that in my own State of North Carolina there are approximately 1,800 boys and girls in training in National Youth Administration centers. They are taught how to run lathes, read blueprints, and many other arts and skills which are badly needed in the successful prosecution of the great and cruel conflict in which we are now engaged. They are learning to be welders, and many girls are now engaged in welding, and each girl is taking the place of an able-bodied workman. They are being trained in the intricacies of radio and many other war-related industries. I am advised that 4,831 trained youths, going from National Youth Administration, have been added to industry's rolls by North Carolina alone.

The Asheville project provided 576 of these youths; the Charlotte master project, 899; the Durham master project, 1,014, and the Greenville master project, 2,342.

In addition to the foregoing youths who entered industry each of these centers provided youths trained in mechanical skills who went into the armed forces. In the 8-month period these skilled and trained workers numbered 353. I understand that out of every 100 men inducted into the armed services, 63 are assigned to duties requiring specialized training. These 63 specialists cannot be obtained

through induction centers, but the Army still needs and must have them.

The National Youth Administration program should be continued and the facilities now available should be used, and this agency should not be liquidated. In the period immediately following the end of this war, in that period when we will be rebuilding the world, skilled and trained workers will be needed in countless numbers, and for that period we must now prepare.

I hope that this House will recede and concur in the Senate amendment and thereby continue the worth-while activities of the National Youth Administration.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE].

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, while there is some difference of opinion in regard to the N. Y. A. in my district, this agency, in my opinion, has amply justified its existence and has been of great assistance to many young men and women in being trained for work that has been beneficial in our war effort. Many of the schools and colleges in Louisiana were able to provide means for young men and women to continue their education, which they would not have otherwise been able to do, and especially in one of the important towns of my district, Rayne, La., there has been established a magnificent center whose facilities have served a large and important section providing training for hundreds of boys and girls who are now engaged in war work. I have received hundreds of letters and telegrams requesting the continuance of the N. Y. A. from my constituents as well as from others throughout my State, and was particularly impressed by the endorsement of Mr. Andrew Higgins, of the Higgins Shipbuilding Corporation, of New Orleans, who strongly advocated the continuance of the N. Y. A., saying that he had hundreds of people in his organization trained by the N. Y. A. who were able to give splendid work in his important shipbuilding and landing-boat plants, and that he recommended an opportunity for boys and girls between the ages of 16 and 18 to be provided with facilities for training for war work and in war industries.

I believe that this House should concur in the conference report allocating funds for the continuance of the N. Y. A. program, and I ask your support for the same.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, we have heard the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] describe this as perhaps an endeavor by certain ones of us to oppose all administration policies. Let me refer to Senate Document 54. Who do we find signing this document? Would the gentleman from Georgia say that WALTER F. GEORGE is not a good Democrat, that CARTER GLASS is not a good Democrat, that KENNETH McKELLAR is not a good Democrat, and

that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] is not a good Democrat? Do you make any such claim about Senator BYRD?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. No; I will not yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman is misrepresenting the position of the Senator from Georgia [Senator GEORGE], who is supporting this legislation.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Most of these gentlemen signed the document dated May 24, in which they advocated eliminating the National Youth Administration as a non-essential expenditure of the taxpayers' money at this time. Consequently, it is far-fetched to claim that this is an endeavor by certain ones of us because of political reasons to throw this unnecessary bureau out of the window of our governmental structure.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, in the words of a country editor back in my district, now is the time to lop off a dead branch of the New Deal tree, and at the same time save \$48,000,000 for the taxpayers of America.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRANT].

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein some letters I have received on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, today a new method of tax collection is imposed on the people of America: Twenty percent of their wages and salaries is to be deducted at the source in order to make a partial payment on the terrific cost of carrying on this war. Even so, the expected income to the Federal Government this year will be no more than one-third of the anticipated expenditures. Higher taxes next year will be inevitable. For this reason, it becomes doubly imperative that we make every effort to cut Federal expenditures in every way possible so long as that restriction will not interfere with the efficient conduct of the war, and of our Government here at home.

The N. Y. A. was undoubtedly set up to serve some real need, but the justification for its continuance has long since passed. In my opinion, this is one of the agencies we can just as well dispense with at this time and it ought to be promptly liquidated.

In the first place, the training program of the N. Y. A. is duplicated many times by other agencies of the Federal Government. The Byrd committee reported that the purpose of the N. Y. A. was duplicated and overlapped at least six times by the training programs in other Government bureaus. This in addition to the fact that American taxpayers are already paying large sums to

private industry for a training program within our war plants. In the second place, the administrative overhead of this agency is all out of proportion to the results accomplished and cannot be justified by any comparison at this time.

In my home city of South Bend, Ind., we have a large N. Y. A. resident training center. It is composed of some 10 or more separate buildings and occupies many acres. During my last trip home I learned that there are now some 125 trainees enrolled at that center, of whom 22 are boys and 103 are girls. These trainees are drawn from the northern half of Indiana and from the State of Illinois as well. In fact, it has been necessary to send solicitors out into the country to encourage youth to attend the center in order to keep the enrollment at anything approaching capacity.

Although the resident center at South Bend serves as the headquarters for Fort Wayne and Gary, Ind., it is shocking to note the tremendous administrative expense at this South Bend center. Administrators, including the project manager, personnel officers, typists, and so forth, call for \$14,460 a year. Supervisory employees, including cooks, recreational directors, maintenance men, custodians, night watchmen, and so forth, call for another \$20,820. Personnel assigned to the maintenance and operation of the shops, including foremen, have a pay roll of \$13,700, making a total of \$48,980 a year in salaries over and above the amounts paid to the trainees during the course of their instruction. This South Bend resident center was erected and equipped in 1941, at a cost which the N. Y. A. reports to me as \$219,000.

I inquired about the N. Y. A. of a representative of the largest high school in South Bend. This public school has a vocational department doing very much the same type of training as the N. Y. A. center, located only 4 miles away. Let me read to you from the letter which has come to me from that representative of South Bend Central Junior-Senior High School:

The school city of South Bend, of course, operates a war production training program of its own. * * * This program has at all times been more extensive and more varied than the National Youth Administration program. * * * We have adequate equipment and ample training stations to run a much larger program than the demand calls for at the present time. The school city of South Bend has courses that parallel all the courses being offered at the National Youth Administration center and in all cases the school city is better equipped for doing the job.

It is becoming more of a problem to recruit young people for the center. One reason for this difficulty lies in the fact that industry is now hiring people, at 65 and 75 cents an hour, and then sending them to training. In most such cases these people do not need the residence feature that the National Youth Administration center offers and usually enter the training offered by the school city of South Bend. In my judgment it will be increasingly more difficult to obtain enrollments in large enough numbers to make it practical to keep the National Youth Administration open.

The judgment of the writer of that letter has been proven correct. It is increasingly difficult to obtain enrollees to make it practical or even justifiable to attempt to continue the operation of this N. Y. A. resident center. As this gentleman further writes in his letter:

Although many National Youth Administration centers have received some criticism, we believe that the South Bend National Youth Administration Residence Center has been operated most efficiently and will probably have students for another 6 months. After that time, if the war continues, it will probably be a struggle to round up enough trainees to operate the center.

A representative of the Marshall County Public Schools in Plymouth, Ind., writes as follows:

There was a time when the National Youth Administration served a very laudable purpose and if its activities were limited to the original program. I would find no objection to it. I understand, however, that this proposed appropriation eliminates the provision for the cooperation with the public schools of the country as well as removing the age limits. It may be possible that there would be no misuse of this power on the part of the National Youth Administration, but it carries with it the possibility of the setting up of a dual system of education without any consideration to local needs or local control.

I believe the Federal Government can, and should, assist financially in the support of public education in those sections that are unable to offer educational opportunities of a type needed to develop good American citizens, but I am unalterably opposed to Federal control. We have too much of it now in connection with vocational education. I am a member of the Indiana State board of education and am in a position to know something of the red tape involved in securing funds for vocational agriculture, vocational home economics, and trades and industry.

It is a dangerous practice in a democracy when there is too much Federal dictation and Federal control over public schools. I trust that Congress will either eliminate entirely the appropriation for the National Youth Administration or transfer its training facilities to the public schools.

Any consideration you give to this matter I am sure will be greatly appreciated by the school people of Indiana.

A representative of the Michigan City public schools writes as follows:

Since the National Youth Administration is only a name instead of a fact anymore, with the changes that have been made on age limits, this will mean that all this money will be spent on the National Youth Administration as an educational or training agency which duplicates and parallels the work being done in public high schools over the United States. The program of national defense training which has been carried by the high schools is sufficient evidence in itself, I believe, both as to the magnitude and the efficiency of the job that they are able to tackle and carry through successfully. This appropriation which is being requested for continuance of the so-called National Youth Administration merely means in the final analysis that it will be used very largely to provide a large number of jobs and salaries to carry out a work which can be done at much less cost and just as efficiently with facilities already established and working. A consequence of this will be not only that money will be siphoned from the regular education program into these channels but it will

mean the establishment of a federalized system of public education with no State or local control. We have already seen enough evidence in other areas of the danger in such an organization.

I trust that you will lend your efforts to defeating the appropriation now being requested for the National Youth Administration for the next fiscal year.

A representative of the school, city of Elkhart, Ind., writes as follows:

The appropriation of these funds is wasteful and can serve no purpose except to establish a federally dominated youth program which will duplicate the efforts of the public schools and tend to divert funds from them, which can only lead to the weakening of our national system of education. * * * This community, and I believe most public communities, are able to more effectively train youth in the locally established public-school systems for war or peacetime projects.

Your opposition to the above appropriation and your support for more Federal funds for local public schools will result in strengthening one of the finest systems of education in the world which is making a very honest effort to faithfully train boys and girls of America in our democratic way of life.

I inquired of the personnel management of the Kingsbury Ordnance Plant, operated by the War Department in my district, and employing upwards of some 15,000 trained workers, both men and women. I asked what, if any, experience the plant had had with employment of N. Y. A. trainees. They wrote me as follows:

A reply to your letter of March 17, has been delayed, because our records were not marked for easy identification of employees who might have had training by the National Youth Administration.

We contacted the National Youth Administration office in South Bend, and on Saturday last, a representative called and presented a long list of names, and picked out the names of certain individuals who had been employed here in the past or were employed at the present time. The total number that the National Youth Administration identified was 12. Of the 12, 6 are still employed. Since the National Youth Administration has never given, and I do not see how they could give a course in shell loading, none of the individuals had any training which was directly applicable to the job they held here. Upon further check, our records indicate that the training received by 3 or 4 persons consisted of a short course in sewing machine operation.

Note that the total number of these many thousands of workers, identified as having been trained by the N. Y. A. center, adds up to the grand sum of 12, of whom 6 were still employed in that ordnance plant.

The plant manager of a large war industry in the District writes me as follows:

The city vocational schools have given us more assistance than any of the Federal projects. Vocational schools will train for us individuals or groups for specified occupations provided, of course, that these schools have the proper equipment.

We have obtained quite a number of trained workers from the vocational schools, but so far as the National Youth Administration is concerned, we have not received any assistance from them. * * *

Looking over the entire training program, which includes National Youth Administra-

tion and several others, it looks to us as though a lot of money is being spent foolishly, and we are glad that you are interested in this subject, especially since appropriations are being requested to continue these projects.

We feel, Bob, that industry can train its own help much better than any outside agency. We have been doing this within our own plant and have met with much success.

In closing, I am firmly of the opinion that the facilities of our public schools are ample to train our youth for war industry, and they are doing this job much more efficiently and much more in keeping with the principles and the ideals of our American way of life.

I hope that the proposal to provide \$47,800,000 for the continuance of this depression-born agency will be defeated and that we will provide for its speedy liquidation.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HARE) there were—ayes 120, noes 144.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 176, nays 197, answered "present" 1, not voting 57, as follows:

[Roll No. 124]

YEAS—176

Abernethy	Folger	McGranery
Allen, La.	Forand	McMillan
Anderson,	Fulbright	McMurray
N. Mex.	Gavagan	Madden
Bates, Ky.	Gibson	Magnuson
Beckworth	Gordon	Maloney
Bennett, Mo.	Gorski	Manasco
Bloom	Granger	Mansfield,
Boren	Grant, Ala.	Mont.
Boykin	Gregory	Marcantonio
Bradley, Pa.	Hagen	May
Brooks	Hale	Mills
Brown, Ga.	Hare	Morrison, La.
Bryson	Harless, Ariz.	Murdock
Bulwinkle	Harris, Ark.	Murphy
Burchill, N. Y.	Harris, Va.	Murray, Tenn.
Burdick	Hart	Murray, Wis.
Burgin	Hays	Myers
Camp	Heffernan	Norrell
Cannon, Fla.	Hendricks	Norton
Cannon, Mo.	Hoch	O'Brien, Ill.
Celler	Hoeven	O'Brien, Mich.
Chapman	Hull	O'Konski
Clark	Jackson	O'Toole
Coffee	Jarman	Outland
Colmer	Johnson,	Pace
Cooley	Calvin D.	Patman
Cooper	Johnson,	Patton
Courtney	Lyndon B.	Peterson, Fla.
Cox	Johnson, Okla.	Peterson, Ga.
Creal	Judd	Poage
Crosser	Kee	Price
Cullen	Keefe	Priest
Cunningham	Kefauver	Rabaut
Curley	Kelley	Ramspeck
D'Alesandro	Keogh	Randolph
Davis	Kerr	Rankin
Dawson	Kirwan	Richards
Delaney	Kleberg	Rivers
Dickstein	Klein	Robinson, Utah
Dilweg	Lane	Rogers, Calif.
Dingell	Larcade	Rogers, Mass.
Douglas	Lea	Rohrbough
Durham	Lemke	Rowan
Eberhart	Luce	Sabath
Feighan	Ludlow	Sadowski
Fellows	Lynch	Sauthoff
Fernandez	McCord	Scanlon
Flannagan	McCormack	Schiffler
Fogarty	McGehee	Schuetz

Scott	Stewart	Wene
Sikes	Talle	Whelchel, Ga.
Simpson, Ill.	Tarver	White
Smith, Maine	Thomas, Tex.	Whitten
Smith, W. Va.	Vincent, Ky.	Wickersham
Snyder	Walter	Winstead
Somers, N. Y.	Wasielewski	Wolverton, N. J.
Sparkman	Weaver	Worley
Spence	Weiss	Wright
Steagall	Welch	Zimmerman

NAYS—197

Allen, Ill.	Gearhart	Miller, Pa.
Andersen,	Gerlach	Monkiewicz
H. Carl	Gilchrist	Monroney
Anderson, Calif.	Gillette	Mott
Andrews	Gillie	Mruk
Angell	Goodwin	Mundt
Arends	Gossett	Newsome
Arnold	Graham	Norman
Auchincloss	Grant, Ind.	O'Brien, N. Y.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Griffiths	O'Neal
Barrett	Gross	Philbin
Bates, Mass.	Gwynne	Pittenger
Beall	Halleck	Ploesser
Bell	Hancock	Poulson
Bennett, Mich.	Hartley	Powers
Bishop	Heidinger	Ramey
Blackney	Herter	Reece, Tenn.
Bland	Hess	Reed, Ill.
Bolton	Hill	Reed, N. Y.
Bonner	Hinshaw	Rees, Kans.
Brehm	Hobbs	Rizley
Brown, Ohio	Hoffman	Robertson
Buffett	Holmes, Mass.	Rockwell
Burch, Va.	Holmes, Wash.	Rodgers, Pa.
Busbey	Hope	Rowe
Butler	Horan	Sasser
Canfield	Howell	Satterfield
Carlson, Kans.	Jeffrey	Schwabe
Carson, Ohio	Jenkins	Short
Carter	Jennings	Simpson, Pa.
Case	Jensen	Slaughter
Chenoweth	Johnson,	Smith, Ohio
Chipfield	Anton J.	Smith, Va.
Church	Johnson, Ind.	Smith, Wis.
Clason	Johnson,	Springer
Clevenger	J. Leroy	Stanley
Coie, Mo.	Johnson,	Starnes, Ala.
Cole, N. Y.	Luther A.	Stearns, N. H.
Compton	Jones	Stefan
Costello	Jonkman	Stevenson
Cravens	Kean	Stockman
Crawford	Kearney	Sullivan
Curtis	Kilday	Sumner, Ill.
Day	Kinzer	Summers, Tex.
Dewey	Knutson	Sundstrom
Dies	Kunkel	Taber
Dirksen	LaFollette	Talbot
Disney	Lambertson	Taylor
Ditter	Landis	Thomas, N. J.
Domengeaux	Lanham	Thomason
Dondero	LeCompte	Tibbott
Doughton	LeFevre	Towe
Dworschak	Lewis	Troutman
Eaton	McCowan	Vorys, Ohio
Elliott	McGregor	Vursell
Ellis	McKenzie	Wadsworth
Ellison, Md.	McLean	Ward
Ellsworth	McWilliams	Weichel, Ohio
Elmer	Maas	West
Elston, Ohio	Mahon	Wheat
Engel	Martin, Iowa	Whittington
Fenton	Martin, Mass.	Wigglesworth
Fisher	Mason	Wilson
Gale	Morrow	Winter
Gamble	Michener	Wolcott
Gathings	Miller, Conn.	Woodruff, Mich.
Gavin	Miller, Nebr.	Woodrum, Va.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Fish

NOT VOTING—57

Andersen,	Gallagher	Merritt
August H.	Gifford	Miller, Mo.
Baldwin, Md.	Gore	Morrison, N. C.
Barden	Green	Nichols
Barry	Hall	O'Connor
Bender	Edwin Arthur	O'Hara
Bradley, Mich.	Hall,	O'Leary
Buckley	Leonard W.	Pfeifer
Byrne	Harness, Ind.	Phillips
Capozzoli	Hébert	Plumley
Cochran	Hollifield	Pracht
Culkin	Izac	Robison, Ky.
Drewry	Johnson, Ward	Rolph
Fay	Kennedy	Russell
Fitzpatrick	Kilburn	Shafer
Ford	King	Sheppard
Fulmer	Lesinski	Sheridan
Furlong	Mansfield, Tex.	Tolan

Treadway	Vinson, Ga.	Willey
Van Zandt	Voorhis, Calif.	Wolfenden, Pa.

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Fish for, with Mr. Harness of Indiana against.

Mr. Pfeifer for, with Mr. Leonard W. Hall against.

Mr. Miller of Missouri for, with Mr. Drewry against.

Mr. Fitzpatrick for, with Mr. Gifford against.

Mr. Capozzoli for, with Mr. Shafer against.

Mr. Merritt for, with Mr. Phillips against.

Mr. Vinson of Georgia for, with Mr. Treadway against.

Mr. Gallagher for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Kennedy for, with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall against.

Mr. Byrne for, with Mr. Plumley against.

Mr. Fay for, with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Bradley of Michigan, against.

General pairs:

Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Ward Johnson.

Mr. Cochran with Mr. August H. Andersen.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Robison of Kentucky.

Mr. Ford with Mr. Pracht.

Mr. Barry with Mr. Rolph.

Mr. Morrison of North Carolina with Mr. Culkin.

Mr. Izac with Mr. Bender.

Mr. Tolman with Mr. O'Hara.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Willey.

Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Van Zandt.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. HARNESSE. If he had been present, he would have voted no. I withdraw my vote, and vote "present."

Mr. DIES changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 30.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the several votes on the conference report was laid on the table.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House ask for a further conference upon the bill (H. R. 2935) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina to ask for a further conference.

The question was taken; and the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER appointed the following conferees: Mr. HARE, Mr. TARVER, Mr. THOMAS of Texas, Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. KEEFE, Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including an article by the dean of the Capital press on this fighting Congress. The Public Printer informs me that the extra cost will be \$252, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed nevertheless.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the remarks made on the bill today certain telegrams.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article on the north Pacific region. The article is over the usual amount, and the Public Printer informs me that it will cost an additional \$171. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed, nevertheless.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include a verse from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHEP A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by my colleague the gentleman from New York, Hon. SOL BLOOM, on the National Radio Forum, conducted by the Washington Evening Star, Wednesday, June 30, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix immediately following the extension just granted to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON] and include an address delivered by the gentleman from New Jersey, Hon. CHARLES A. EATON, over the National Radio Forum conducted by the Washington Evening Star, over WMAL, Wednesday, June 30, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a speech by Hon. Joseph E. Davies.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address I delivered over C. B. S. Tuesday evening, June 29, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint

resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2349. An act to adjust the pay status of warrant officers temporarily commissioned in the Army of the United States;

H. R. 2943. An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the United States Government;

H. R. 3026. An act relating to appointments to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy in the case of redistricting of congressional districts; and

H. J. Res. 139. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate oil compact to conserve oil and gas.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1991. An act to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the postponement of the induction of high-school students who have completed more than half of their academic year.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 832. An act relating to the sale of horse meat or food products thereof in the District of Columbia; and

S. 1109. An act to increase by \$400,000,000 the amount authorized to be appropriated for defense housing under the act of October 14, 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2481) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate further insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, disagreed to by the House; asks a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. SMITH, Mr. NYE, and Mr. McNARY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report and statement upon the bill (H. R. 2719) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2719) "making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 5, 11, 19, 27, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 80, 81, 89,

90, 92, 93, 136, 137, 145, 146, 152, 179, 182, 183, 195, and 196.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8, 9, 28, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 40, 59, 60, 82, 151, 178, and 199; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,052,015"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$811,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$866,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$9,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: At the end of the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out "\$700,000", and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$530,000, and in addition thereto, the unexpended balances for this purpose contained in the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, and the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1943, are continued available during the fiscal year 1944"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$217,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$85,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$25,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$875,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$786,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$450,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree

to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$29,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$285,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$697,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$50,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$412,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$140,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$85,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$95,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$237,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$40,415"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$63,835"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$9,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$13,495"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$24,825"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$23,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to

the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$11,625"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$3,875"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$7,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$11,350"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$13,575"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$4,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$114,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$115,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$114,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$115,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$235,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$4,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$42,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$19,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$36,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$182,490"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$70,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 76: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,238,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 77: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 77, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$5,657,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 78: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$575,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 79: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 79, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$2,785,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 83: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 83, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 17 of said amendment, strike out "\$600" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"Support of Osage Agency and pay of tribal officers, Oklahoma (tribal funds): For the support of the Osage Agency, and for necessary expenses in connection with oil and gas production on the Osage Reservation, Oklahoma, including pay of the superintendent of the agency and of necessary employees, and pay of tribal officers; payment of damages to individual allottees; repairs to buildings, rent of quarters for employees, traveling expenses, printing, telegraphing and telephoning, and repair and operation of automobiles, \$170,000, payable from funds held by the United States in trust for the Osage Tribe of Indians in Oklahoma: *Provided*, That of the said sum herein appropriated \$7,500 is hereby made available for traveling and other expenses of members of the Osage Tribal Council, business committees, or other tribal organizations, when engaged on business of the tribe, including supplies and equipment, not to exceed \$6 per diem in lieu of subsistence, and not to exceed 5 cents per mile for use of personally owned automobiles, when duly authorized or approved in advance by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs: *Provided further*, That no part of the funds appropriated herein shall be available for the collection of any income due the Osage Tribe of Indians or the enrolled members thereof where such income is not deposited to the credit of the said Osage tribal funds account or to the credit of the proper member's account."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 86: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 86, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$950,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 87: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Amendment numbered 183: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 183, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$464,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 185: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 185, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$175,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 186: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 186, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 187: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 187, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$140,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 189: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 189, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$580,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 191: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 191, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 193: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 193, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$740,660"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 197: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 197, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$140,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 198: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 198, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$5,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 15, 85, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 103, 104, 105, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 142, 149, 154½, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 169, 172, 173, 174, 184, 190, 192, 194, 200, and 201.

JED JOHNSON,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
W. F. NORRELL,
ALBERT E. CARTER,
ROBERT F. JONES (except
as to amendments Nos. 1, 102, 106, and 116),
BEN F. JENSEN,

Managers on the part of the House.

CARL HAYDEN,
KENNETH McKELLAR,
ELMER THOMAS,
JOHN H. BANKHEAD,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
GERALD P. NYE,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2719) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the

action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. 1: Appropriates \$1,052,015 for salaries, office of the Secretary, instead of \$1,028,560, as proposed by the House, and \$1,072,270, as proposed by the Senate. The increase of \$23,455 above the House figure will provide \$3,200 for an administrative assistant for the Assistant Secretary, \$15,000 for the Division of Information, and \$5,255 for the Division of Power.

No. 2: Appropriates \$108,620, as proposed by the House, instead of \$139,470, as proposed by the Senate, for the Division of Territories and Island Possessions.

Nos. 3, 4, 5, and 6, relating to the Grazing Service: Appropriates \$866,700 for salaries and expenses instead of \$856,700, as proposed by the House and \$882,700, as proposed by the Senate, the increase of \$10,000 over the House figure being provided for fire-suppression work; provides \$75,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$78,000, as proposed by the Senate, for construction and maintenance of range improvements; and appropriates \$9,000 for leasing of grazing lands, instead of \$8,000, as proposed by the House, and \$10,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 7: Appropriates \$530,000 and unexpended balances of prior appropriations for fire protection of forests (national defense), instead of \$700,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 8, 9, 10, and 11, relating to contingent expenses: Provides for a reduction of \$5,000 in the stationery supplies allowance for the National Park Service, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates \$500 for the purchase of books, instead of \$400, as proposed by the House, and \$600, as proposed by the Senate; and allows an additional allocation of \$4,500 for the purchase of books from funds available to the Bureau of Mines, as proposed by the House, instead of \$6,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 12, 13, and 14, relating to printing and binding: Appropriates \$217,500, instead of \$167,500, as proposed by the House, and \$237,500, as proposed by the Senate, of which \$85,000 is specifically provided for the Bureau of Mines and \$25,000 for the Fish and Wildlife Service.

SOLID FUELS ADMINISTRATION FOR WAR

No. 16: Appropriates \$875,000, instead of \$850,000, as proposed by the House, and \$895,000, as proposed by the Senate.

GENERAL LAND OFFICE

No. 17: Appropriates \$786,300 for salaries, instead of \$778,300, as proposed by the House, and \$790,300, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 18: Appropriates \$450,000 for surveying public lands, instead of \$400,000, as proposed by the House, and \$500,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 19: Appropriates \$345,000 for salaries and expenses, branch field examination, as proposed by the House, instead of \$350,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 20: Appropriates \$29,500 for fire suppression in Alaska, instead of \$29,000, as proposed by the House, and \$30,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 21: Appropriates \$285,000 for certain Oregon and California timber lands, instead of \$270,000, as proposed by the House, and \$290,000, as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

No. 22: Appropriates \$697,800 for departmental personal services, instead of \$692,860, as proposed by the House, and \$704,620, as proposed by the Senate, the increase in the House figure being provided for a so-called "liaison group" stationed in the District of Columbia.

No. 23: Appropriates \$50,000 for travel and other expenses, instead of \$49,000, as proposed by the House, and \$51,320, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 24, 25, 26, 27, and 28, relating to industrial assistance: Appropriates \$412,500 for preservation of timber, instead of \$400,000, as proposed by the House, and \$425,000, as proposed by the Senate; provides \$140,000 for expenses incidental to the sale of timber, instead of \$135,000, as proposed by the House, and \$145,000, as proposed by the Senate; \$85,000 for inspection of mines on Indian lands, instead of \$80,000, as proposed by the House and \$90,000, as proposed by the Senate; provides \$600,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$660,000, as proposed by the Senate, for agriculture and stock raising; and strikes out the provision of the House placing a limitation on departmental personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 29: Appropriates \$95,000 for the development of water supply, instead of \$90,000, as proposed by the House, and \$100,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, and 60, relating to the operation, maintenance, and repair of Indian irrigation systems: Appropriates \$237,750 for the operation and maintenance of numerous small irrigation projects, instead of \$220,000, as proposed by the House, and \$255,500, as proposed by the Senate; provides \$40,415 for "miscellaneous projects", instead of \$25,000, as proposed by the House, and \$55,830, as proposed by the Senate; and further provides \$68,835 for general administration of Indian irrigation projects, instead of \$66,500, as proposed by the House, and \$71,170, as proposed by the Senate. Appropriations for the operation and maintenance of additional irrigation projects specifically appropriated for, are provided as follows:

Project	Amount
San Carlos, Ariz.....	\$345,000
Colorado River Indian Reservation, Ariz.....	27,495
Yuma Reservation, Calif.....	11,500
Fort Hall, Idaho.....	47,925
Fort Belknap Reservation, Mont....	15,500
Fort Peck, Mont.....	12,535
Blackfeet Indian Reservation, Mont..	24,925
Flathead Reservation, Mont.....	235,000
Crow Reservation, Mont.....	46,500
Uncompahgre, Uintah, and White River Utes, Colorado.....	55,000
Wapato system, Yakima Reservation, Wash.....	183,420
Wind River Reservation, Wyo.....	48,000

No. 61: Appropriates \$70,000 for protection of project works (national defense) instead of \$50,000, as proposed by the House, and \$75,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, and 73: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate to appropriate \$2,302,000 for the construction and repair and enlargement of the several Indian irrigation systems enumerated in said amendments.

Nos. 74 and 75, relating to Indian education: Appropriates \$5,864,665, as proposed by the House, instead of \$5,894,205, as proposed by the Senate, and restores the provision of the House providing that \$22,190 shall be payable from tribal funds for the tuition of Chippewa Indian children.

No. 76: Appropriates \$1,233,800 for education of natives in Alaska, instead of \$1,233,800, as proposed by the House, and \$1,245,000, as proposed by the Senate, the increase of \$5,000 in the House figure representing additional funds for relief purposes.

No. 77: Appropriates \$5,657,300 for conservation of health among Indians, instead of \$5,642,800, as proposed by the House, and \$5,666,300, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 78: Appropriates \$575,000 for medical relief in Alaska, instead of \$570,680, as proposed by the House, and \$580,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 79: Appropriates \$2,785,000 for general support and administration of Indian property, instead of \$2,785,200, as proposed by the House, and \$2,780,400, as proposed by the Senate, the increase of \$4,600 in the sum proposed by the Senate being provided to pay the salary of the tribal attorney for the Osage Indians.

No. 80: Appropriates \$700,000 for relief of Indians, as proposed by the House, instead of \$825,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 81: Appropriates \$80,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$90,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the reindeer service in Alaska.

No. 82: Appropriates not to exceed \$2,000 from tribal funds for expenses incidental to the sale of timber on the Choctaw-Chickasaw Sanatorium Reserve, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 83: Provides for expenses of tribal officers, Five Civilized Tribes, Oklahoma, as proposed by the Senate, with the exception that the salary of the chief, Creek Nation, is fixed at \$1,200, as proposed by the House, instead of \$600, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 84: Appropriates \$170,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$185,000, as proposed by the House for support of the Osage Agency, Oklahoma. The language proposed by the Senate has been approved with the following amendments: The language specifically providing for the tribal attorney and his stenographer has been eliminated. Funds for the salary of the tribal attorney have been added to the gratuity item for support and administration and reference to the stenographer is unnecessary as authority for the employment of necessary personnel is contained in the paragraph as approved by the conferees. Funds for the salary of the superintendent are provided for under this tribal fund appropriation.

No. 85: Appropriates \$950,000 for roads, instead of \$750,000, as proposed by the House, and \$1,200,000, as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Nos. 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, and 95, relating to the operation and maintenance of reclamation projects: Appropriates, in lieu of the sums proposed by the House, and the Senate, the following amounts for the projects set forth below:

Project	Amount
Yuma, Ariz.-Calif.	\$67,500
Boise, Idaho	93,600
Minidoka, Idaho	16,500
Rio Grande, New Mex.-Tex.	90,000
Owyhee, Oregon	180,000
Klamath, Oreg.-Calif.	130,000
Yakima, Wash.	248,000
Riverton, Wyo.	63,000
Shoshone, Wyo.	16,200

No. 102: Appropriates \$350,000 for investigations, reclamation fund, instead of \$275,000, as proposed by the House, and \$700,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 106: Appropriates \$200,000 for investigations of the Colorado River Basin, instead of \$100,000, as proposed by the House, and \$500,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 116: Appropriates \$350,000 for investigations from the general fund, instead of \$250,000, as proposed by the House, and \$800,000, as proposed by the Senate.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

No. 122: Provides \$52,500 for the purchase of passenger-carrying vehicles, instead of \$35,000, as proposed by the House, and \$70,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 123: Appropriates \$177,570 for salaries in the District of Columbia, instead of \$173,000 as proposed by the House, and \$182,140, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 124 and 125, relating to geological surveys: Appropriates \$1,187,500, instead of \$880,000, as proposed by the House, and \$1,380,000 as proposed by the Senate; and provides \$492,500 for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Nos. 126 and 127, relating to mineral resources of Alaska: Appropriates \$150,000, instead of \$74,000, as proposed by the House, and \$198,365, as proposed by the Senate; and provides that \$43,500 shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Nos. 128 and 129, relating to the classification of lands: Appropriates \$225,000, instead of \$95,000, as proposed by the House, and \$275,000, as proposed by the Senate; and provides that \$55,000 shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Nos. 130, 131 and 132, relating to printing and binding: Appropriates a total of \$310,425 for this purpose, instead of \$295,000, as proposed by the House, and \$325,855, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 133 and 134, relating to mineral leasing: Appropriates \$475,000, instead of \$339,600, as proposed by the House, and \$550,325, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 135: Corrects a total.

BUREAU OF MINES

Nos. 136 and 137: Appropriates \$67,765 for salaries and expenses, instead of \$68,765, as proposed by the Senate; of which \$56,000 is made available for personal services in the District of Columbia, instead of \$57,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 138 and 139, relating to operating mine rescue cars and stations: Appropriates \$680,700, instead of \$673,200, as proposed by the House, and \$688,200, as proposed by the Senate; and provides that \$64,600 shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Nos. 140 and 141, relating to coal-mine inspections and investigations: Appropriates \$722,880, instead of \$718,380, as proposed by the House, and \$727,380, as proposed by the Senate; and provides that \$61,950 shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Nos. 143 and 144, relating to testing fuel: Appropriates \$375,000, instead of \$340,000, as proposed by the House, and \$380,455, as proposed by the Senate; and provides that \$63,500 shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Nos. 145 and 146, relating to mineral mining investigations: Appropriates \$440,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$443,245, as proposed by the Senate; and provides that \$50,000 shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Nos. 147 and 148, relating to oil and gas investigations: Appropriates \$533,380, instead of \$328,380, as proposed by the House, and \$538,380, as proposed by the Senate; and provides \$42,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Nos. 150 and 151, relating to mining experiment stations: Appropriates \$629,500, instead of \$550,000, as proposed by the House, and \$704,500, as proposed by the Senate; and provides that \$22,000 shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia.

No. 152: Appropriates \$110,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$114,500, as proposed by the Senate, for maintenance of buildings and grounds at Pittsburgh, Pa.

Nos. 153 and 154, relating to economics of mineral industries: Appropriates \$475,650, instead of \$450,000, as proposed by the House, and \$501,300, as proposed by the Senate; and provides that \$322,500 shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia.

No. 164: Appropriates \$490,000 for production of alumina from low-grade bauxite, etc. instead of \$430,000, as proposed by the House, and \$495,875, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 165, 166, 167, and 168, relating to investigation of bauxite and alunite ores and aluminum clay deposits: Appropriates \$1,860,000 for investigation of bauxite and alun-

ite ores and aluminum clay deposits, instead of \$478,500, as proposed by the House, and \$1,960,000, as proposed by the Senate; provides that \$52,500 shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia; and that \$317,000 shall be available to the Geological Survey, of which \$19,800 may be used for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Nos. 170 and 171, relating to investigation of deposits of critical and essential minerals: Appropriates \$3,900,000, instead of \$2,475,000, as proposed by the House, and \$4,010,000, as proposed by the Senate; and provides that \$84,000 shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia. The conferees recommend that not to exceed \$40,000 of the sum provided for this purpose be used for exploratory and other work in connection with the Coaldale coal deposits of Esmeralda County, Nev.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

No. 175: Appropriates \$337,500, instead of \$300,000, as proposed by the House, and \$375,000, as proposed by the Senate, for departmental personal services.

No. 176: Appropriates \$186,110, for regional headquarters, instead of \$161,110, as proposed by the House, and \$245,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 177: Appropriates \$23,000, for general expenses, instead of \$20,000, as proposed by the House, and \$26,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 178: Appropriates \$1,876,200, as proposed by the Senate, for national parks, the increase of \$15,000 over the House figure being to provide for maintenance of the proposed Big Bend National Park, Tex.

No. 179: Strikes out the provision of the Senate appropriating \$25,000 for the acquisition of the estate of Patrick Henry.

No. 180: Appropriates \$155,000 for forest protection and fire prevention, instead of \$140,000, as proposed by the House, and \$170,000, as proposed by the Senate.

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

No. 181: Appropriates \$293,540 for fishery industries instead of \$125,000, as proposed by the House, and \$470,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 182: Appropriates \$80,000, as proposed by the House instead of \$84,000, as proposed by the Senate, for the fishery market news service.

No. 183: Appropriates \$464,500 for Alaska fisheries, instead of \$459,000, as proposed by the House, and \$470,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 185: Appropriates \$175,000 for biological investigations, instead of \$125,000, as proposed by the House, and \$225,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 186: Appropriates \$750,000, for control of predatory animals, instead of \$740,000, as proposed by the House, and \$1,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 187: Appropriates \$140,000 for enforcement of Alaska game law, instead of \$130,000, as proposed by the House, and \$152,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 188 and 189, relating to maintenance of mammal and bird reservations: Appropriates \$530,000, instead of \$540,000, as proposed by the House, and \$620,315, as proposed by the Senate; strikes out the proposal of the Senate to acquire land for the Charles Sheldon antelope range in Humboldt County, Nev., and provides \$40,000 to lower the level of a lake in the Wichita Mountain Wildlife Refuge and to divert the excess water of such lake to Lake Lawtonka.

No. 191: Appropriates \$1,000,000 for Federal aid in wildlife restoration, instead of \$750,000, as proposed by the House, and \$1,250,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 193: Appropriates \$740,660 for departmental personal services, instead of \$700,000,

as proposed by the House, and \$816,546, as proposed by the Senate.

GOVERNMENT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

No. 195: Appropriates \$168,820, as proposed by the House, instead of \$174,620, as proposed by the Senate, for salaries of the Governor and other employees, the reduction of \$5,800 in the Senate amount being due to the elimination of the salary of the Government Secretary of the Virgin Islands.

No. 196: Appropriates \$37,640, as proposed by the House, instead of \$40,000, as proposed by the Senate for expenses of the agricultural experiment station.

No. 197: Appropriates \$140,000 for defraying the deficit in the treasury of the municipal government of Saint Croix, instead of \$125,000, as proposed by the House, and \$150,000, as proposed by the Senate.

MISCELLANEOUS

No. 198: Provides \$5,000 for attendance at meetings by officers and employees of the Bureau of Mines.

No. 199: Inserts the provision of the Senate with reference to the Jackson Hole National Monument.

AMENDMENTS REPORTED IN DISAGREEMENT

The following amendments are reported in disagreement:

No. 15. Relating to the amount of the unobligated balance of the appropriation "Construction, operation, and maintenance, Bonneville power transmission system", to be available in the fiscal year 1944 for expenses of marketing and operation of transmission facilities, and administrative costs in connection therewith.

No. 85. Relating to the purchase of United States Treasury War bonds for members of the Shoshone Tribe of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming.

Nos. 96, 97, 98, 99, 100 and 101. Relating to the following reclamation projects under the reclamation fund: Boise project, Idaho; Payette Division; Deschutes project, Oregon; Klamath project, Oregon-California; River-ton project, Wyoming; and Shoshone project, Wyoming, Heart Mountain Division.

Nos. 103 and 104. Relating to administrative expenses in connection with the projects included in amendments Nos. 96-101, inclusive.

No. 105. Total, reclamation fund.

No. 107. Provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall make a report to Congress prior to December 31, 1943, on expenditures from the Colorado River Dam fund incurred in the construction, operation, and maintenance of Boulder City, together with his recommendations for allocations of such expenditures between the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Boulder Canyon project and other Federal activities in Boulder City.

Nos. 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, and 115. Relating to the following reclamation projects under the general fund: Gila project, Arizona; Central Valley project, California; Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado; Boise project, Idaho; Anderson Ranch; Lugert-Altus project, Oklahoma; Tucumcari project, New Mexico; and Yakima project, Washington, Reza Division.

Nos. 117 and 118. Relating to administrative expenses in connection with the projects included in amendments Nos. 108-115, inclusive.

No. 119. Total, general fund, construction.

No. 120. Relating to water conservation and utilization projects.

No. 121. Relating to services or labor of prisoners of war, enemy aliens, and American-born Japanese, who are in the control of the Federal Government, in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of Federal reclamation projects, water conservation and utilization projects, Indian irrigation projects, and related work, subject to

the approval of, and regulations by, the War Department or other Federal agency having control of such persons.

No. 142. Relating to the protection of mineral resources and facilities (national defense).

No. 149. Relating to the purchase of land, Bartlesville, Okla.

Nos. 154½, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, and 160. Relating to investigation of raw material resources for steel production (national defense).

No. 161. Relating to gaseous and solid fuel reduction of iron ores (national defense).

Nos. 162 and 163. Relating to manganese beneficiation pilot plants and research (national defense).

No. 169. Relating to magnesium pilot plants and research (national defense).

No. 172. Relating to a drainage tunnel, Leadville, Colo. (national defense).

No. 173. Relating to the sale of any metal or mineral product that may be manufactured in pilot plants operated from funds appropriated to the Bureau of Mines, and provides that the proceeds of such sales shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

No. 174. Total, Bureau of Mines.

No. 184. Relating to fur-resources investigations, and the purchase of land, buildings, and other privately owned property at the United States Rabbit Experiment Station, Fontana, Calif.

Nos. 190 and 192. Totals relating to the Fish and Wildlife Service.

No. 194. Relating to plans and specifications for vessels or contract personal services for the preparation thereof in connection with activities of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

No. 200. Makes legal obligations incurred after June 30, 1943, and prior to enactment of bill into law.

No. 201. Changes a section number.

JED JOHNSON,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
W. F. NORRELL,
ALBERT E. CARTER,
ROBERT F. JONES (except
as to amendments Nos. 1, 102, 106, and 116),
BEN F. JENSEN,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report upon the bill H. R. 2719, the Interior Department appropriation bill, 1944, and ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I will make a very brief statement.

While there has not been time to check all the items in the report which has been agreed upon, I feel perfectly safe in saying to the Members in connection with the amendments we have agreed upon and which are in this report before the House, that the amount of the bill is considerably below the Budget estimate figures. The House conferees have insisted on bringing this bill back to the House below the Budget figures from the very beginning, and that is what we are doing today.

We were unable to persuade the Senate conferees to agree with us in this desire altogether, and there are 47 items that we cannot agree upon. The bill as it passed the Senate, as the Members will recall, is \$20,749,060 in excess of the

Budget estimates. As it passed the House the bill was nearly \$10,000,000 under the Budget estimates. The Senate added \$55,000,000 to the House bill. There are 47 amendments in disagreement, as I said a moment ago, of which 29 are in actual disagreement. These amendments are primarily construction projects inserted by the Senate, without Budget estimates, or with an estimate for only a portion of the amount contained in the bill. We will discuss those items in disagreement after the conference report is acted upon.

I think there is no controversy as to the conference report proper at all.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Will the gentleman advise those of us who are interested in these construction projects whether or not any of them have been agreed to by the House and Senate, or are they all still in disagreement?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. None of the reclamation projects has been agreed upon. They are all in disagreement at this time.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. And the report so shows that?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 15: Page 9, line 10, strike out "\$3,200,000" and insert "\$3,287,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment No. 15.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RANKIN moves that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 15.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that all debate on this amendment close in 23 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that he is in charge of the time and can move the previous question at any time he desires. However, the debate on this particular amendment is limited to 23 minutes.

The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 15 to provide this extra

\$87,000 asked for by the Bonneville Administration.

The development on the Columbia River has been one of the greatest pieces of progressive development ever instituted by the Government of the United States. We now have on that great stream two hydroelectric power dams that are not only supplying electricity for our war effort but also for the surrounding country.

The Bonneville Administration has asked for this amount in order to carry on its usual program. I know this was cut down on the theory that we could abolish certain regional offices and concentrate all this work at one place. Whenever you do that you will increase rather than decrease the cost of administering that great project. It will cost more to send people back and forth to these various regions than it will to maintain these regional offices; besides, you would not take a single person off the pay roll. It will cost more to send those people back and forth and do the telephoning, telegraphing, and travel, and to carry on the other expenses of decentralizing these various branches of this agency than it would to appropriate the amount asked for by the Senate, asked for by the Bonneville Administration, and provided by the Senate amendment.

The Bonneville Administration is a long way from where I live, it is true; but the principle is exactly the same. I have seen the same effort made to cripple the Tennessee Valley Authority. I do not know of anything you could do that would hamper the T. V. A. more than to abolish its regional offices, because, as I said, it would increase rather than diminish the cost of administering and operating that great enterprise.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. The amount carried in the Senate amendment, you say, is to be allocated for the purpose of operating the regional offices on projects already in existence?

Mr. RANKIN. That is my understanding.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. It is not to carry on explorations or other activities?

Mr. RANKIN. Of course, there are some explorations that are still being carried on from the central office. But there are a great many phases of this work that will probably be carried on by these regional offices, if these regional offices remain; there is also work that must be carried on from the central office, but, as I said, it would cost more to carry all this work on from the central office than it would from these regional offices.

So, instead of bringing about economy, in my opinion, the adoption of the House provision, and turning down the Senate amendment, would not only cripple the Bonneville administration but it would also increase the cost in the long run.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that my motion will be sustained.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, perhaps it would be more appropriate for those opposing this appropriation to make a statement and to tell us just what they have in mind.

Let me clarify the issue: The \$87,000 which is involved, was authorized by the Budget. It was requested by the Bonneville Administration. It is not a new appropriation; it is merely the reallocation of funds already appropriated for carrying on the everyday work of the Bonneville Administration. You understand that the Bonneville Administration has control over both the Bonneville project and the Grand Coulee project on the Columbia River. These two great projects now are furnishing the electricity which will provide 30 percent of the aluminum which we are using in the United States in our war effort. We would not be meeting with the success that we are meeting now on foreign battlefields if it were not for the aluminum that is being manufactured right today in these aluminum plants on the Columbia River using Bonneville power.

This item of \$87,000 in issue is a minor sum when compared to the amount involved in the great war industries on the Columbia River, the great projects that are being carried forward and the immense investment which the Federal Government itself has not only in the two hydro projects themselves but in the war industries using this hydro power which are manufacturing ships, airplanes, airplane parts, and various other war materials in which aluminum and electricity is used.

It seems to me we would be following a penny-wise and pound-foolish policy to make cuts or try to curtail the ordinary expenses in this great war industry.

This is not a local problem. It strikes at the heart of the operation of one arm of the great war projects in America today which means the success or failure in the manufacture of aluminum for airships.

If you take the airplanes out of the air today our success in the war would stop; it would mean defeat in the Solomon Islands; it would mean defeat in Guadalcanal; it would mean defeat in Attu Island; and it would mean defeat on every battlefield in which the armed forces of America are fighting today. If MacArthur had had bombers and fighter planes he would have held the Philippines.

Yet, if the motion by the committee before us now prevails, if you agree with the recommendation of the committee to strike out \$87,000, that is the result. And bear in mind this is not a new appropriation; it is merely the reallocation of funds already appropriated needed for carrying on the ordinary operations of these projects.

These plants are in successful operation and are bringing into the coffers of the Federal Government millions of dollars a year; these projects are paying investments; there is no boondoggling

involved; they represent fundamental, sound financial investments which are paying their own way. Millions of dollars are coming from their operation and going into the United States Treasury every year. The Bonneville Administrator estimates this expenditure of \$3,287,000 will bring into the United States Treasury \$15,000,000.

The \$87,000 involved is a minor amount. Most of this fund is to be used for the field offices to take care of the work in the large territory in the Northwest, which is supplied with electricity from these two great hydroelectric plants, Bonneville and Grand Coulee.

You understand there is a grid system of transmission facilities which extend throughout Oregon and Washington and a part of the State of Idaho, and extends down and connects with California, so that if California's power is cut off in an emergency, this great pool of electricity will be available. These field offices are for the purpose of coordinating the different branches of this great industry and keeping it working to win the war.

I do hope that you, my colleagues, here today will not cripple this great industry, so vital in the war effort, and strike at the heart of a great war endeavor, and that you will not deny the Bonneville Administration the \$87,000 so necessary to carry on its ordinary activities.

Mr. Speaker, when this bill was before the House on May 20, I called to the attention of the House the part these hydroelectric plants or the Columbia are playing in the war effort. I want again to recall to you these facts.

The facts are that when our Nation entered this war, we were ill prepared to fight a modern war. Such wars are based on highly developed electrochemical and electrometallurgical industries. Through the operations of international cartels, during the period from 1920 to 1941, this Nation was relegated to an inferior position in this field of activity. Those of us who have investigated this matter early knew that Germany was expanding such industries by 1,000 percent of the capacity available in 1933.

It is hard to realize how this Nation would have been able to cope with the existing situation without the early provision for Federal hydropower. It is apparent to those of us who are familiar with the situation that our Nation's expenditure of blood and treasure would have been far greater if we had no early expanded electrical capacity, so as to make electrometallurgical and electrochemical processes early available.

At least 75 percent of the light metals going into our air program comes from the Federal power plants in the Pacific Northwest, in California, the Western States, and the Southeast. The largest portion of these light-metal requirements comes from the western plants. Appropriation provisions for these western plants comes within the jurisdiction of the Interior Committee. It has been stated on several occasions that "preparedness depends on foresight." Without the foresight of this committee, our country would have been ill-prepared.

When the factual history of our war effort is written the work of this committee will stand out as an outstanding example of vision. The sad part of the story is that the men in the war agencies did not have vision or make full use of the authority and funds that Congress provided. Congress was way in advance of the war agencies on the light metal, rubber, mineral, and power problems when it passed the Thomas Act and provided funds for Federal hydro plants and the necessary investigations and processes connected therewith. What is more remarkable still, this vision was exercised in the midst of highly conflicting points of view growing out of the public-private power controversy. These controversies, from my observation point, are secondary to the proper utilization of our resources, both in peace and war. I pointed out the basic facts on the power, metal, and rubber situation when I addressed this House in May 1940—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 8, page 5786. This was 8 days before the President addressed both Houses on the emergency and what lay ahead.

From this observation point it can be plainly seen that the prime industries of the future will be those engaged in the production of electrochemicals and electrometals. Airplanes and our future commerce will not be possible without such productivity. In addition, we, as the arsenal for the world, are drawing on our own resources at a rate higher than any of us can visualize. We must find substitutes, if we are to hold our own as a first-class nation.

It is clear that to Congress belongs the task of post-war planning. In the consideration of such planning this House will find that they will have to consider two approaches to the resources phase. These approaches will be concerned with an inventory and use of the national resources that should be dedicated to future new competitive commercial uses, and secondly, such planning must cover necessary substitutions for those resources entering the depletion cycle.

Energy and power will play an important part in such future planning. Base metal electroproduction must come from low-cost power. The post-war unemployment problem is definitely tied up with adequate and proper resource utilization.

I deem it advisable for the membership of this House to be fully acquainted with the war-power developments in the Axis countries of Norway, and especially in Japan. We on the Pacific coast are especially interested in what Japan has and will be doing. Such an investigation will bring out the advanced preparations of all of these countries to secure world domination.

The South American situation also needs close study. That continent has nearly 50,000,000 horsepower of potential hydropower which is largely unused. This South American power is extremely high class on account of great falls and heavy, steady rainfalls. In the hands of unfriendly competitors, it can become a threat to our position. Nearly half of this South American potential power lies

in Brazil in close proximity to high-quality and extensive mineral deposits. Another highly important study should cover the depletion of our own resources and an inventory of what we have and what we need. The growing pains experienced by our war agencies bespeak the necessity of a worth-while inventory.

I have been impressed particularly by these agencies' part in the shipbuilding program now being carried on by Henry J. Kaiser in the Pacific Northwest region. I doubt if there is any question in anyone's mind as to the importance of the Kaiser shipyards.

I think too many of us have not realized the importance of electric power in ship production. We hear of ship production always in terms of the large number of workers required. We usually hear of ship production in terms of astronomical man-hour figures, but it is quite apparent to anyone who delves into the subject that the modern, high-speed shipbuilding, which may prove the salvation of the United Nations is at least equally dependent upon high-speed electrically operated tools, such as heavy-duty cranes, presses, drills, lathes, and particularly the electric welding arc. These tools have been the instruments through which ship fabrication has been reduced from the World War No. 1 record of 236 days to less than 10 days at present in some cases. The yards in my district lead the country in ship production speed.

One kilowatt of electric power is necessary to make every five shipyard workers effective. A yard employing 50,000 men must have at least 10,000 kilowatts of electricity. If the electricity is not available, the 50,000 men must work under the obsolete methods of 25 years ago.

The figures given by Department of the Interior officials to the Appropriations Committee show that the Northwest region as a whole, and particularly the area around the city of Portland where the Kaiser shipyards are located would be a power shortage area if it were not for Bonneville Dam and Grand Coulee Dam, and for the system of transmission lines and substations through which the electric power from those two dams is transmitted to the industrial sections.

The power companies established in the Portland area have for several years been dependent upon Columbia River power which has been made available to them. Without this power they would be unable to meet the rapidly growing needs of their normal market, to say nothing of the added demands for power placed upon them by the shipyard developments. In view of this fact I am convinced that the present is no time to deny the reasonable request of the Department of the Interior for the use of funds for operation and maintenance.

On the basis of the committee's evidence I believe the Department of the Interior has been cooperating with existing privately owned utility systems in the region. It is pouring its power without stint into practically all of these systems. Through these interconnec-

tions Columbia River power is being made available not only to the shipyards in the Portland area but in the Puget Sound area as well.

Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the following excerpts from the hearings, page 470, showing the operations of the Bonneville agencies:

The vital role being played by the Administration in the war program is indicated by the fact that the region will be producing about 30 percent of the total aluminum pig capacity of the Nation, utilizing more than 625,000 kilowatts of power, which is more than the ultimate capacity of Bonneville Dam when completed—518,400 kilowatts; an aluminum rolling mill capable of producing 240,000,000 pounds of aluminum sheet annually, and using approximately 50,000 kilowatts of power; production of tremendous tonnage of new ships, 1 shipyard alone turning out 113 Liberty ships during 1942, with a dead-weight tonnage of over 1,000,000 tons; a steel-rolling mill capable of producing 72,000 tons of steel annually, requiring 14,000 kilowatts of power; the production of magnesium requiring 57,000 kilowatts of power; and many other essential products, such as calcium carbide, sodium chlorate, and ferroalloys. In addition, many other types of industries which are not direct customers of Bonneville have developed in the region in the war production effort, all of which development would have been impossible had not these power projects been built by the Federal Government. The war strategy has also required the construction of many airports, Army camps, naval stations, and other similar establishments of the War and Navy Departments in this area. The Administration has undertaken the servicing of all these activities, including defense housing projects, which have been necessary because of the tremendous increase in the number of defense workers required for this expanded production program.

As a result of recommendations made by the Administration for the acceleration of construction of electrical facilities in the region in anticipation of the present crisis, Bonneville Dam, which was scheduled for completion in 1946, will now be completed in 1943, and installation of generators at Grand Coulee Dam has been advanced so that six units will be in operation by February 1944, in addition to two Shasta units loaned to Grand Coulee for the duration of the war. Three more generating units have been authorized at Grand Coulee by Congress, but their completion date thus far is indefinite due to priority difficulties.

The present rated generating capacity at these two dams of 626,000 kilowatts will be increased by the end of the calendar year 1943 to more than 1,200,000 kilowatts—approximately 100-percent increase in capacity during this calendar year. The increasing tempo of the Administration's part in the war effort is reflected in its power deliveries since 1940:

Year	Kilowatt-hours	Increase over previous year
1940	354,208,000	
1941	1,508,728,000	1,214,520,000
1942	3,939,600,000	2,370,872,000
1943 ¹	7,637,800,000	3,698,200,000
1944 ¹	9,647,533,000	2,009,733,000

¹ Estimated.

To meet these large increases in load, a rapid expansion of transmission facilities to take the tremendous quantities of power from the generating plants to the load centers was required. The construction of electrical facilities, accelerated in 1941 in anticipation of these new loads, was interrupted

upon the declaration of war in order to conserve critical material. Only such lines and substation requirements were continued as were necessary to maintain minimum service to war plants. The rapid expansion of these facilities is best illustrated by the following data:

Fiscal year—	Mile-years of line in operation	Substations	Kilovolt-ampere-years capacity
1940.....	52.1	3	14,910
1941.....	614.6	25	265,020
1942.....	1,403.6	34	840,625
1943 ¹	2,228.9	50	1,639,369

¹ This includes only projects authorized as of Jan. 1, 1943.

FINANCIAL STATUS

The accomplishments of the Administration and the effect of contracts and new commitments are being reflected in the revenues being returned to the Treasury. A summary of actual revenues received to June 30, 1942, with estimated revenues for the fiscal years 1943 and 1944, follows:

1940, actual.....	\$367,900
1941, actual.....	1,874,645
1942, actual.....	6,160,368
1943, estimated.....	12,003,519
1944, estimated.....	18,007,166

Estimated total June 30, 1944..... 37,413,593

The Bonneville Agency, which is under consideration, operates the transmission facilities, markets the power, and collects the revenues. The Corps of Engineers, another agency, operates the Bonneville generating plant. Its power costs have been allocated as provided by law. The Grand Coulee plant is operated by another agency, the Bureau of Reclamation. It is not completed, and its first costs have not been allocated as provided in the reclamation law. Therefore in approaching a pay-out cost determination we can deal with absolute figures as far as Bonneville power plant and Bonneville Power Administration are concerned and estimated figures for Grand Coulee. This will be close enough for the purposes at hand.

I will not deal with this over-all figure by combining the figures given in the hearings with citation thereto. The figures I am covering apply to the fiscal year 1944 as given in the record. Revenues and expenses are given for other years also, but for brevity I will cover the 1 year:

The gross revenue given on p. 480 is.....	\$18,085,500
Operating and depreciation expenses, Bonneville Power Administration alone, p. 481.....	4,271,990
Net Bonneville Power Administration operating income, p. 481.....	13,813,510
Interest on Bonneville Power Administration Federal investment, p. 481.....	2,145,696
Net income available for power cost and surplus, and operating expenses at generating stations, p. 481.....	11,667,814
The operating expenses at stations, p. 521.....	1,344,675
Net for interest and amortization of 2 dam plants.....	10,323,139

The only item that need be covered to complete the over-all pay-out calculation is the interest and amortization of

the plant costs allocated to power. This is given on page 518 of the hearings, and when considered with the generating plant operating expenses I have just cited, shows surplus over-all charges of all kinds of \$3,267,000 for the fiscal year 1944. These figures definitely answer the question of returns as given from the balance sheet figures submitted by the Administrator.

I must add a word of caution at this point, and that is not to take random figures scattered throughout the hearings. The only correct approach is via the balance sheet route as given on pages 480 and 518 of the record.

The real control must not be lost in any discussion. This control is the requirement of the basic act that requires rate reviews every 5 years to insure a balance sheet return to the Federal Treasury. It is mandatory for the Administrator to charge rates which will insure a full return.

I need to point out that the War Production Board has not used these facilities to their fullest extent. If they had we would have had more planes in the hands of General MacArthur.

The Department of the Interior is asking for no new appropriations for the Bonneville Power Administration in 1944. It is asking only for congressional approval to reallocate \$3,287,000 of moneys already appropriated so that the Bonneville Administration can carry on its operation and management functions effectively during the next fiscal year.

Such funds are to be used primarily for the purpose of transmitting power to war industries in the Pacific Northwest with a combined metal-plant valuation in the neighborhood of \$300,000,000. Those plants are all being operated by private enterprise and their combined value is roughly equal in amount to the total investment thus far in Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams and the Federal electric power transmission system which takes the power from those dams to market.

I should like to point out that power, when it is made in the generators at Grand Coulee Dam and at Bonneville Dam, is of little value to anyone. There are no big cities close to either of those dams. There are no industries located at either of those dams. Bonneville and Grand Coulee power is of value only when it can be delivered to the industrial centers and the military zones of the Northwest.

That is what the Department of the Interior, through the Bonneville Power Administration, is doing, and that is the purpose of the requested funds.

I am informed that 95 percent of all Bonneville and Grand Coulee power will be delivered to war industries during the next fiscal year. These war enterprises include pig aluminum plants capable of producing more than 630,000,000 pounds of raw metal annually, one of the largest sheet-rolling mills in the country, a new magnesium metal plant with 800 electric furnaces, several chemical plants devoted to the manufacture of explosives and other war materials, a number of alloy plants which make materials vital in the production of armor plate and oth-

er hard-steel products, and at least one dozen military installations such as Army and Navy airfields, depots, and encampments. All of these enterprises are war enterprises; and all of them require electric power which they would be unable to receive if it were not for the Federal development of the Columbia River. For the delivery of power to all of these enterprises and to others which will be established during the fiscal year 1944, the Bonneville Administration will collect more than \$15,000,000—perhaps as much as \$20,000,000—which will be paid into the Treasury of the United States. These power sales will more than double the volume of sales by the Bonneville Administration during the past 12 months.

The Bonneville Administrator has testified before the Appropriations Committee that he will require \$3,287,000 to operate his agency. More than 10 percent of that money is required for armed guards to protect the system against accident and sabotage.

According to the Bonneville Administrator's figures 3,287,000 operating dollars will put into the United States Treasury more than \$15,000,000.

That sounds like good business. I urge the approval of this item in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] such time as he may wish.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made earlier in the day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the Members of the House that this House was satisfied with this bill when it went through. We gave the Bonneville Power Administration \$3,200,000 for the purpose of carrying on its work. We listened to the testimony of Dr. Raver, who is head of the Bonneville Power Administration, and we listened to other witnesses from the Bonneville Power Authority and we thought then and we think now that the amount of money provided in the bill was ample to carry on that very splendid project. The failure to restore the amount carried in the Senate amendment, \$87,000, is certainly not going to cripple that great project.

By the way, I visited the Bonneville project a few months ago and they are doing a very fine piece of work. The appropriation the House gave them is not going to hamper them in any way. Dr. Raver testified before our committee a short time ago that they had sale for all the power they were producing there. I saw some of the great industrial plants that were being operated by that power. They are very fine plants and I want to say to the membership of the House, having listened to all the testimony that was presented, having visited this great plant, I believe they are amply provided for by the terms of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question. The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi that the House recede and concur.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 44, noes 72.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 113, noes 223, answered "present" 1, not voting 94, as follows:

[Roll No. 125]

YEAS—113

Abernethy	Gossett	Morrison, La.
Anderson, N. Mex.	Granger	Mott
Angell	Grant, Ala.	Murdock
Barrett	Gregory	Murphy
Bland	Hagen	Murray, Tenn.
Boykin	Hale	Newsome
Bradley, Pa.	Harless, Ariz.	Norman
Brooks	Heffernan	O'Brien, Mich.
Bulwinkle	Heldinger	O'Connor
Burchill, N. Y.	Hendricks	Outland
Burdick	Hinshaw	Patman
Camp	Hobbs	Patton
Carson, Ohio	Hoch	Peterson, Fla.
Coffee	Holmes, Wash.	Philbin
Cole, Mo.	Horan	Pittenger
Cooley	Hull	Poage
Cooper	Jackson	Price
Costello	Johnson	Priest
Courtney	J. Leroy	Ramey
Creal	Lyndon B.	Randolph
Crosser	Judd	Rankin
Curley	Kefauver	Richards
D'Alesandro	Kelley	Rivers
Davis	Klein	Robinson, Utah
Dawson	LaFollette	Sadowski
Delaney	Larcade	Sauthoff
Dingell	Lemke	Scanlon
Dworshak	Lynch	Sparkman
Ellsworth	McCord	Spence
Feighan	McGranery	Stefan
Fernandez	McKenzie	Stockman
Flanagan	Madden	Sullivan
Fogarty	Magnuson	Voorhis, Calif.
Folger	Manasco	Weich
Gavagan	Mansfield	White
Gearhart	Mont.	Wickersham
Gordon	Marcantonio	Winstead
Gore	Miller, Nebr.	Wolverton, N. J.
		Wright

NAYS—223

Allen, Ill.	Burgin	Dondero
Allen, La.	Busbey	Doughton
Andersen, H. Carl	Butler	Douglas
Anderson, Calif.	Canfield	Durham
Andrews	Cannon, Fla.	Eaton
Arends	Carlson, Kans.	Eberhart
Arnold	Carter	Ellis
Auchincloss	Case	Ellison, Md.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Celler	Elston, Ohio
Bates, Mass.	Chapman	Engel
Beall	Chenoweth	Fellows
Beckworth	Chipperfield	Fenton
Bell	Church	Fish
Bender	Clark	Fisher
Bennett, Mich.	Claason	Forand
Bennett, Mo.	Cleveneger	Gale
Bishop	Compton	Gamble
Blackney	Cox	Gathings
Bloom	Cravens	Gavin
Bolton	Crawford	Gerlach
Boren	Cunningham	Gibson
Brehm	Day	Gilchrist
Brown, Ga.	Dewey	Gillette
Brown, Ohio	Dickstein	Gillie
Bryson	Dies	Goodwin
Buffet	Dilweg	Gorski
Burch, Va.	Disney	Graham
	Domengeaux	

Grant, Ind.	Luce	Scott
Gwynne	Ludlow	Short
Halleck	McCormack	Sikes
Hancock	McCowan	Simpson, III.
Hare	McGehee	Simpson, Pa.
Harris, Va.	McGregor	Slaughter
Hays	McLean	Smith, Maine
Herter	McWilliams	Smith, Ohio
Hill	Mahon	Smith, Va.
Hoeven	Martin, Iowa	Smith, W. Va.
Hoffman	Martin, Mass.	Smith, Wis.
Holmes, Mass.	Merrow	Somers, N. Y.
Hope	Michener	Springer
Howell	Miller, Conn.	Stanley
Jarman	Miller, Mo.	Steagall
Jeffrey	Miller, Pa.	Stewart
Jenkins	Mills	Sumner, Ill.
Jennings	Monkiewicz	Sumners, Tex.
Jensen	Monroney	Sundstrom
Johnson	Mruk	Talbot
Anton J.	Mundt	Talle
Johnson	Murray, Wis.	Tarver
Calvin D.	Norrell	Taylor
Johnson, Ind.	O'Brien, N. Y.	Thomas, Tex.
Johnson	O'Konski	Thomason
Luther A.	O'Toole	Tibbott
Johnson, Okla.	Pace	Towe
Jones	Peterson, Ga.	Troutman
Jonkman	Poulson	Vorys, Ohio
Kearney	Powers	Vursell
Kee	Ramspeck	Walter
Keefe	Reece, Tenn.	Ward
Kerr	Reed, Ill.	Wasielewski
Kilday	Reed, N. Y.	Welch, Ohio
Kinzer	Rees, Kans.	Wene
Kirwan	Rizley	West
Kleberg	Robertson	Wheat
Knutson	Rockwell	Whelchel, Ga.
Kunkel	Rodgers, Pa.	Whitten
Lambertson	Rogers, Calif.	Whittington
Landis	Rogers, Mass.	Wigglesworth
Lane	Rohrbough	Willey
Langham	Sabath	Wilson
Lea	Sasser	Winter
LeCompte	Satterfield	Wolcott
LeFevre	Schiffner	Woodruff, Mich.
Lewis	Schuetz	Zimmerman
	Schwabe	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Gross

NOT VOTING—96

Andresen	Hall	Floeser
August H.	Leonard W.	Plumley
Baldwin, Md.	Harness, Ind.	Pracht
Baird	Harris, Ark.	Rabaut
Barry	Hart	Robison, Ky.
Bates, Ky.	Hartley	Rolph
Bonner	Hébert	Rowan
Bradley, Mich.	Hess	Rowe
Buckley	Holifield	Russell
Byrne	Izac	Shafer
Cannon, Mo.	Johnson, Ward	Sheppard
Capozzoli	Kennedy	Sheridan
Cochran	Keogh	Snyder
Cole, N. Y.	Kilburn	Starnes, Ala.
Colmer	King	Stearns, N. H.
Culkin	Lesinski	Stevenson
Cullen	McMillan	Taber
Curtis	McMurray	Thomas, N. J.
Dirksen	Maas	Tolan
Ditter	Maloney	Treadway
Drewry	Mansfield, Tex.	Van Zandt
Elmer	Mason	Vincent, Ky.
Fay	May	Vinson, Ga.
Fitzpatrick	Merritt	Wadsworth
Ford	Morrison, N. C.	Weaver
Fulbright	Myers	Weiss
Fulmer	Nichols	Wolfenden, Pa.
Furlong	Norton	Woodrum, Va.
Gallagher	O'Brien, Ill.	Worley
Gifford	O'Hara	
Green	O'Leary	
Griffiths	O'Neal	
Hall	Pfeiffer	
Edwin Arthur	Phillips	

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Cannon of Missouri for, with Mr. Taber against.

Mr. Snyder for, with Mr. Ditter against.

Mr. Ford for, with Mr. Vinson of Georgia against.

General pairs:

Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Dirksen.
Mr. Barry with Mr. August H. Andresen.

Mr. Drewry with Mr. Harness of Indiana.
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Robison of Kentucky.

Mr. Bonner with Mr. Elmer.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Ward Johnson.
Mr. Pfeiffer with Mr. Hess.
Mr. Cochran with Mr. Rowe.
Mr. King with Mr. Shafer.
Mr. Merritt with Mr. Floeser.
Mr. Morrison of North Carolina with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. Izac with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Pracht.
Mr. May with Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. Byrne with Mr. Culkner.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Treadway.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.

Mr. Fay with Mr. O'Hara.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.
Mr. Mansfield of Texas with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Curtis.
Mr. Tolan with Mr. Maas.
Mr. Vincent of Kentucky with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.

Mr. Cullen with Mr. Phillips.
Mr. Starnes of Alabama with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.

Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Stevenson.
Mr. Weaver with Mr. Hartley.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Gross.
Mr. O'Neal with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Hart with Mr. Rolph.
Mr. Furlong with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.
Mr. Barden with Mr. Van Zandt.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON and Mr. STEWART changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question recurs on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LANHAM). The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 85: Page 55, line 21, add: "That the Secretary of the Interior be authorized and directed, with the consent of the business committee of the Shoshone Tribe of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming, to purchase one United States Treasury War bond of the denomination of \$500 for each member of said Shoshone Tribe according to the official roll of said tribe on the date of the approval of this Act, and pay the total cost of the bonds so purchased out of the accrued interest in the judgment fund of said tribe in the Treasury. Said bonds shall be purchased and registered in the name of each enrolled member of the Shoshone Tribe and when issued shall be held in trust for such Shoshone Indian by the United States to the date of maturity, whereupon said bond shall be delivered to the owner thereof free from such trust. Said bond shall not be sold or encumbered in any manner by the Shoshone owner nor shall said bond become liable, payable, or subject to any debt or debts contracted by the Shoshone owner prior to the date of maturity. In the event of the death of the Shoshone owner prior to the date of maturity, said bond, if not devised or bequeathed by will, shall descend to his or her heirs or next of kin as provided by existing law, subject to the existing trust. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to grant permission to the county chairman

of the War bond purchase program of Fremont County, Wyo., in which county the Shoshone Tribe resides, to include the total amount of bonds purchased for the members of said tribe in his quota of War bond sales."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: "On page 55, line 21, strike out the word 'Interior' and insert in lieu thereof 'Treasury'; and in the same line after the word 'authorized' insert 'and directed.'"

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that amendments numbered 96 to 105, inclusive, be considered together.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 96: Page 66, strike out lines 1 to 9, inclusive, and insert the following:

"Construction: For continuation of construction, and for general investigations and administrative expenses, of the following projects in not to exceed the following amounts, respectively, to be expended from the reclamation fund in the same manner and for the same objects of expenditure as specified under the caption 'Bureau of Reclamation', under the head 'Administrative provisions and limitations', but without regard to the amounts of the limitations therein set forth, all to be reimbursable under the reclamation law, and to remain available until expended."

Amendment No. 97: Page 66, line 20, insert "Boise project, Idaho, Fayette division, \$500,000."

Amendment No. 98: Page 66, line 21, insert "Deschutes project, Oregon, \$250,000."

Amendment No. 99: Page 66, line 22, insert "Klamath project, Oregon-California, \$420,000."

Amendment No. 100: Pages 66, line 23, insert "Riverton project, Wyoming, \$500,000."

Amendment No. 101: Page 66, line 24, insert "Shoshone project, Wyoming, Heart Mountain division, \$350,000."

Amendment No. 103: Page 67, line 17, strike out "\$45,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$70,000."

Amendment No. 104: Page 67, line 18, strike out "\$65,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$175,000."

Amendment No. 105: page 67, line 19, strike out "\$1,338,500" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,084,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

Mr. Speaker, may I say in connection with this matter that after conferring with the Members who are interested in some of these projects we have decided to consider them en bloc. I may say that the House conferees have been willing for the most part to go along where there is a Budget estimate for these projects. In some instances we have thought that we could cut a little below the Budget estimate. In this instance there

is only one project that has a Budget estimate. Therefore the committee felt justified in insisting on its disagreement to them.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CARTER. I think the chairman of the subcommittee will agree with me, too, that all of these projects—I think I am correct in saying all—have stop-orders against them issued by the War Production Board. Is that not correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct. That is true, with the possible exception of one. There may be one of these projects where the stop-order has been lifted.

Mr. CARTER. I think that is true. The stop-order has been lifted or partially lifted; but as to the others, they have stop-orders.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I agree with the gentleman. I think I should further add that all of these projects are commendable projects. I think they would be desirable, probably the finest thing that we could think of for a post-war program. It occurs to me that if either the stop-orders should be lifted or Budget estimates secured by the time we return in September, then the Deficiency Committee certainly will consider and may well consider these projects favorably. I think I may say that it will consider all of these projects for which stop-orders may be lifted. I am a member of that Deficiency Committee, and I think I know how the members feel about anything that will produce more food. We are not opposed to the projects; I want to make that perfectly plain. I am very strongly for reclamation projects, even though I have none in my own district. The truth about this is that we have neither Budget estimates nor War Production Board approval for these projects with the possible exception of one.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CARTER. May I say that I concur in what the gentleman says in regard to these projects that lack Budget estimates and lack removal of the stop-orders. Even if we do recess, we are going to be back here in September. If those stop-orders are removed and Budget estimates are obtained, the projects can be presented at once to the deficiency committee and we can consider them in an orderly way.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. What is the purpose of the stop-orders? Materials?

Mr. CARTER. Yes. The purpose of the stop-order is to conserve critical materials. When the War Production Board says there is a sufficient supply of those critical materials to carry on these reclamation projects, then we can go on with them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may also add in that connection that the War

Production Board has been lifting these stop-orders on many of the reclamation projects, on some of them at least, but not those in this particular group. As they get the information they are removing the stop-orders. But our committee has made it a point to either have a Budget estimate or approval of the War Production Board and I hope the House of Representatives will back this committee in that position. We either have got to do that or else we must take all of them, whether they have stop-orders or whether they have the approval of the Budget Bureau.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I will be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona who has been in the forefront of the fight for reclamation projects in his State. I commend him very highly on that and I have usually voted with him on those things.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the gentleman. I have been fighting for reclamation projects not only in my State but also outside of my State wherever they might be in the western part of our country.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. It is quite reassuring to me to have the assurance of the two gentlemen in charge of the bill that some stop orders are now being lifted and that these worthy food projects may be considered a little later. However, I want to say in all seriousness, Mr. Speaker, that we have not yet discovered how serious this food shortage business is. In my opinion, we are holding too sacredly to Budget estimates. Every one of these projects has been O. K'd, if not formally tentatively at least, by Donald Nelson and by Chester Davis. I believe we are making a mistake if we do not begin at once, not in 60 days from now, to make available facilities for additional food production.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CARTER. Does the gentleman understand that Donald Nelson has approved a number of these projects here, the stop orders have been removed, and we are declining to give them consideration?

Mr. MURDOCK. I think Donald Nelson wants more food produced, and he wants it done on these very projects. Chester Davis took a more positive stand.

Mr. CARTER. I want to say to the gentleman that we have been proceeding in an orderly way; and if the War Production Board has removed some of these stop orders, if they have given consideration to the removal of others, on any project on which the stop order is removed, it will receive the very serious consideration of this committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I would say that when this bill was originally considered by the House we called a representative of the War Production Board before the committee and pointed out the necessity for growing more food. We urged that they reconsider all of these

reclamation projects to see whether or not they would have critical materials with which to finish them.

May I point out to you that irrespective of what we may do, even though we may make every dollar available, as long as those stop orders are not lifted there is not a chance in the world of getting those reclamation projects finished.

We are trying to be helpful. If you will read the hearings of the House committee you will find that we devoted many pages to this important subject of producing more food. If the House will permit us to go along in an orderly way, we think we shall be able to work it out to the satisfaction of a great many Members of the House. We believe this is the way to do it.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma, who is also interested in the only reclamation project in Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. There is one statement I should like to have cleared up. The gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER] said that we could consider additional irrigation and reclamation expenditures later when the War Production Board determined that strategic materials were available. I call your attention to a letter written to the Honorable CARL HAYDEN, United States Senator, in response to a letter he wrote to Donald Nelson on the 8th of June. The answer includes this language, and I quote:

The grade of steel from which reinforcing bars are rolled is not considered critical at this time, and with the essentiality established, the tonnage you require should be readily available from (1) current stocks, (2) producers of rail-steel bars, or (3) producers of billet steel using top cuts, discard, etc.

The facilities of producers and fabricators are not now being fully employed, due primarily to the gradual completion of the war construction program. We can foresee no appreciable change in this situation for the duration.

So there are enough strategic materials, ample labor, and sufficient equipment to proceed with these irrigation and reclamation projects now. The new War Food Administrator is favorable toward a program that would insure completion of the projects as provided in the Senate amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. May I say to the gentleman that that letter has been a very valuable letter in assisting the Bureau of the Budget and the members of the committee. As a result of that letter, to some extent, the project in which the gentleman is interested, the Lugert-Altus project, the only one in Oklahoma, got a Budget estimate for \$1,500,000. I think I am safe in saying to the gentleman that the committee would be willing to go along with that Budget estimate, but there is an additional sum of \$435,000 above the Budget estimate. I think that money could be expended admirably. I think it is one of the finest reclamation projects in the United States. I doubt that there is any other project that can exceed it in any way on the basis of money expended. However,

as chairman of the subcommittee I cannot be in the position of saying simply because this is an outstanding project and because my friend and a good many of my friends from Oklahoma are so interested in it, that I must insist on going above the Budget estimates for my own State, but that I am unwilling to go above the Budget estimates for many other projects throughout the country.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Of course, I am just as interested in the whole food program throughout the United States as I am in my district. As a matter of fact, it is true that this project in Oklahoma, which is the only one in that State, does require less strategic material to complete and does provide more irrigation, per acre cost, than any other project. However, I am in favor of the completion of all of them.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] said that if the Budget did approve the amount requested he would be willing to accept the Budget estimate. Permit me to state that I have a letter from the Bureau of the Budget dated June 26 in reply to one I wrote them several days prior thereto, showing that the Bureau of the Budget has approved the Lugert-Altus project for the full \$1,985,000, which reads as follows:

In reply to your letter of June 16, 1943, please note in the Department of the Interior appropriation bill, fiscal year 1944 (H. R. 2719), now before Congress, there is an item of \$1,985,000 for the Lugert-Altus project of Oklahoma. This amount should provide sufficient funds to complete all the construction work which you mentioned in your letter.

HAROLD D. SMITH,
Director.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is a very nice letter, and I commend the gentleman on getting it, but it is not a Budget estimate. It mentions the information which the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM] mentioned in his letter. That is not a Budget estimate. The Bureau of the Budget does not send Budget estimates up here in that manner. I have read the letter to the conferees, and we are glad to have the information it contains, but we have taken the position that we must proceed in an orderly manner. I want to be helpful to the gentleman, but I hope he will not insist on placing me in the embarrassing position of going above Budget estimates. I may say that I have talked with the sponsor, Senator AUSTIN, over the telephone, and he was perfectly willing to go along when I explained the situation.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 107: On page 70, line 16, after "set forth", insert the following: "Provided, That the Secretary of the Interior shall make a report to the Congress prior

to December 31, 1943, on expenditures from the Colorado River Dam fund incurred in the construction, operation, and maintenance of Boulder City, together with his recommendations for allocations of such expenditures between the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Boulder Canyon project and other Federal activities in Boulder City (and whether such allocation should be retroactive)."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 107 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 9 of said amendment after the word "City", strike out the remainder of the line and all of line 10.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate amendments 108 to 120, inclusive, be considered together.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. The House is proceeding at a considerable disadvantage. It is late, we have been through a long day, and we are now asked to consider a number of amendments en bloc, when we have not had an opportunity to have the report of the conferees before us. It is practically impossible for Members to follow the procedure with a large number of amendments being considered en bloc.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, let me say that I made this request after conferring with several Members who are especially interested in these particular projects. The committee had not planned to do this. We are doing it as a matter of accommodation to those interested, and if they do not want to consider it in that way, it is all right with the members of the committee. We are simply trying to accommodate Members.

Mr. CASE. It is evident from the report now that we are not going to get a recess this week, we must go over until next week, and I cannot understand the reason for prolonging the session as late as we are doing it, if we cannot get away this week. If the House were to adjourn at this time, the report of the conferees could be printed in the RECORD, and we would know what we are doing, but when a large number of amendments are proposed to be considered en bloc, and in between the intervening numbers there was a group of amendments accepted in the original report of the conferees, and it is extremely difficult to follow the procedure. Unless there is some further reason given why it is necessary to proceed in this way, I think we should not go on.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. The exact recommendation is made with reference to every one of these projects, namely, that the House conferees continue to insist, and therefore it ought to be very simple to follow the procedure. It is a very simple motion.

Mr. CASE. In the preceding request the gentleman made, I notice that the

request was made that we proceed from 96 to 106 or 107, whatever it was, and then I find that somewhere in between there are some amendments in the original report which was read from the Clerk's desk, but which no Member had a chance to read or to consult so as to be sure what amendments are in the request.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, is it not true that one amendment included in the list of the gentleman from Oklahoma is numbered 120, on which there is a disagreement? One hundred and twenty covers the \$4,000,000 to implement the Wheeler-Case law, covering all of these small projects.

Mr. CASE. The gentleman from Montana knows that those small projects should not be considered en bloc with the large ones.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is what I say. It should not be included, and therefore I shall object.

Mr. CASE. What is the intention of the committee on conference about procedure tonight?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I would hope that we could complete the bill, but if not, that we could go along as far as possible.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn. We are not legislating intelligently.

Mr. CASE. We cannot complete this conference report tonight.

Mr. RANKIN. There is no use sitting here until 10 o'clock tonight.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. This bill was supposed to be passed and sent to the President on Wednesday. It carries a large appropriation for the Department of the Interior, and it may be impossible to finish the bill this evening. If it would be more agreeable I am willing to withdraw No. 120 from the list. I am inclined to think that this particular amendment ought not to be included in this bloc. I simply did that because it was suggested I do so and I will modify my motion to that extent.

Mr. CASE. I ask the gentleman what estimate he has made of the time we may adjourn tonight, if we proceed further.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I have not made any estimate. I am trying to expedite matters.

Mr. CASE. Is there any prospect that we could get through in the next 20 minutes? If there is, there will be some sense in proceeding, but if we are to go along until 9 or 10 o'clock tonight, it does not seem sensible to proceed further.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is a matter that is up to this House, but I am willing to work until 9 o'clock tonight if necessary.

Mr. CASE. If we are going to have a session here tomorrow and Monday, what is the use? I see the distinguished majority leader on the floor, and I wonder if he could give us any idea about the prospect for adjournment tonight.

Mr. McCORMACK. As the gentleman is aware, I have always tried to conduct the affairs of the House, to transact the business of the House, with a minimum of hardship to each and every one

of us, because the minimum is tremendous for all of us. I realize that. I suggest to the gentleman that we go along for awhile and see just what develops. There is a conference going on now, I am anxious to find out just what the result of that conference might be. That is something that I expect to know within a reasonable time.

Mr. CASE. If we are waiting for the other conference, if there is any prospect of getting it, then I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I shall object to including amendment No. 110 in that block, because a great many Members are interested in that amendment, which is with reference to the transmission line from Shasta Dam to Oroville, Calif.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Then we might as well withdraw them all if that is going to be the attitude.

Mr. RANKIN. That is going to be my attitude.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I call for the regular order.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 108: Page 71, line 23, after the word "Arizona", insert "\$1,000,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 108.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 109: Page 71, line 24, strike out "Not to exceed \$200,000 from unexpended balances of appropriations", and insert "Provided, That this appropriation and appropriations heretofore made."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 109.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 110: Page 72, line 8, at the end of the line strike out "\$11,500,000" and insert "Kennett division, \$15,374,000, of which \$1,900,000 shall be available for the construction of the Shasta Dam-Oroville transmission line and terminal facilities; Friant division, \$10,640,000; and Delta division, \$2,686,000; in all, \$28,700,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the House conferees direct me to insist on the disagreement of the House, and I move that the House insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 110.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion. I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment No. 110.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most important propositions that has come before the Congress at this session.

This amendment means more to the people of northern and central California than any other provision that has been offered, in my opinion, at this session of Congress.

We have just completed building the Shasta Dam and one other dam in the Central Valley. This bill provides for the building of a power line, a high-power line, down to Oroville, Calif. As you all know, Sacramento is the capital of California, one of the great cities of the far West. They have their own municipal light and power system. They are entitled to the same treatment accorded the people of Nashville, Tenn., Tupelo, Miss., or any other place in the T. V. A. area or elsewhere.

The Administration is tremendously interested in having this built by the Department of the Interior. In other words, the Administration is interested in owning this line as a part of the Central Valley project.

If you kill this amendment, then you shut the door of hope in the faces of the people of that section of California. You will say to those people, "Although we have spent 75 or 80 million dollars building that tremendous power dam that should be used for the people of California, you will now have to pay tribute to the private-power monopoly if you get the benefits of this great national project at all." Today the people of that section of California are overcharged \$45,000,000 a year for their electricity, as I showed by the tables I placed in the Record on yesterday. Southern California, in the Los Angeles area, is served by Boulder Dam. They have the lowest power rates in the West, outside of Washington and Oregon. But here where we built this great dam, supposedly for the benefit of the public, the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. that has been overriding the law with reference to the Hetch Hetchy power for San Francisco, is turning heaven and earth in order to prevent the building of this line. They want to monopolize this power.

The people in that area are entitled to the same treatment we are receiving in the Tennessee Valley area. They are entitled to the same treatment people are receiving along the Columbia River. We should adopt this motion and provide this power line which the administration wants and says is vitally necessary to carry out the program instituted in the Central Valley.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is this the project about which the President wrote a letter expressly urging and hoping that the appropriation would be made to put it into operation?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes, sir. The President wrote that letter and sent it to me by messenger on yesterday. In that letter he says, "To stop the Government's construction through lack of funds would result in delaying the completion of the

line and hence the utilization for war purposes of Shasta power."

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. In his letter he said it is necessary and important as a part of the war effort, did he not?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes. He said I definitely believe that the appropriation should be made so that this piece of war-time construction may be completed.

Down in that Oroville area we have war projects that are going to need this Shasta Dam power. But this private concern is trying to get between us, trying to get between the United States Government, between the people of Sacramento, between the people of California and this great wealth of power that we already own, in order to monopolize it.

I hope that my motion will be sustained.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say to the gentleman from Mississippi that I have always gone along with him almost blindly on the power question, but there is a great deal more involved in his amendment than the power question.

What the gentleman is asking, when he makes his motion to recede and concur in the entire amendment, involves a great deal more and I am sure he does not mean to say what he has asked, because nobody who is interested in this question is going to ask for several million dollars above what the Budget requested. He does not mean to make that request, I am sure; he does not want this House to give \$28,700,000 to one project when the fact is that they already have at least \$10,000,000 or \$12,000,000 more than they were able to spend last year. The gentleman does not mean that, I am sure.

I have gone along with the gentleman from Mississippi, but I am not willing to go along and to give one project, the Central Valley project, many millions of dollars more than they really need simply in order to carry that one item to which the gentleman from Mississippi refers.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. The thing that I am wondering about, even though we make the appropriation requested for the purpose of building these transmission lines, is that there are only two metals that are suitable for use in transmission lines, one is copper and the other is aluminum. We are now taking the pennies of the school children in order to try to increase the supply of copper, and we are melting down our kettles to make aluminum available for airplanes. Where is the metal going to come from for these transmission lines?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am sure the gentleman from California can answer the gentleman's question better

than I can and I will yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] 5 minutes.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, whether or not we authorize this appropriation, the copper is going to be consumed; the transmission lines will be built by the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. or they will be built by the United States Government, so whether we vote the Rankin motion up or down, there will be no saving of critical materials in either event. That issue is not involved.

The Government of the United States, through an appropriate agency, has indicated that it is necessary for this project to go forward; that the building of these transmission lines is imperative and that the allocation of the critical materials needed, be promptly made. There is no question but what the transmission lines should be built and should be built right now. The project falls in the classification of war projects, so declared.

Let me point out this important fact to the House: This dam which has been referred to, is the third largest dam in the world. It is not built where people are living in great numbers; it is built back up in the high mountains, in the wilderness, where there is no market for electricity at all. We have already spent in excess of a hundred million dollars on the various phases of this project. One of the most important features of the project has to do with the production of electrical energy. What kind of businessmen are we going to turn out to be, if we, as the board of directors of this great country of ours, provide for the building of a great project consisting of a dam and generators high up in the mountains and then fail to make any provision whatsoever for the bringing of that electricity down to the load centers where it can be put into use by the people who are waiting so hungrily for it?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ELLIOTT. The gentleman has just made the statement that we have spent millions of dollars. He does not mean that, does he?

Mr. GEARHART. Precisely so. The project is going to cost \$325,000,000, according to the estimates of today. Already the Government has appropriated and we have already spent on the project upward of a hundred million dollars.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman tell us who is going to pay this \$300,000,000 plus?

Mr. GEARHART. The project will be financed in the usual way. The money will be appropriated, as we are appropriating it today, and then, in accordance with the established policies of the Government, a portion will be recaptured and, to that extent the Treasury will be reimbursed.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Who is going to pay for the transmission lines?

Mr. GEARHART. The people who consume the electricity.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. What people?

Mr. GEARHART. We, the people of the United States, those who live in the area that will be served.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. All of us?

Mr. GEARHART. Yes; all of us who fall in that category.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Why do not the consumers pay for it?

Mr. GEARHART. Of course, the consumers will. The electricity is not going to be given away. It will be sold. Of course, the electrical energy will be disposed of in the market.

Mr. Speaker, I come from a county that does not expect to get a single kilowatt-hour of this electricity. I come from a section of the State hundreds of miles to the south of where this electricity will be consumed. I live in a section of the great Central Valley wherein the only benefit that we shall obtain from the project shall be in the form of irrigation water. It is water that the people I represent are primarily interested in. We who live hundreds of miles south of the Shasta Dam are interested in the proper development of electrical generation and distribution in the far North, as it is the profitable sale of electrical energy that will make the project economically feasible.

If we cannot develop this electric energy on the project and sell it at a profit the water will be so expensive for the people that I am trying to get it for that they will not be able to pay the price. In the event that an appropriation for the construction of these transmission lines is not made and the project is compelled to sell its electrical energy at a loss to the P. G. & E., at whose mercy the project will then be, the hopes and aspirations of the farmers I am seeking to serve are dashed. As it is water and water alone that we hope to secure through the development of the Central Valley project, we who live hundreds of miles away fight for electric generators and power lines and steam stand-by plants make the fight for power. It is the only way we can get the water at a price we can afford to pay.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I would like to ask the gentleman if the best way to protect the Nation's investment in the Shasta Dam project is not to get this power down to the consuming centers so the electricity can be sold?

Mr. GEARHART. Of course. All we ask is an opportunity to bring this electricity from this dam in the wilderness over the Government-owned electric wires down to where it can be sold. If the Rankin motion fails, the management, the control of the Central Valley water project will pass into the hands of

a private corporation, to be in effect absorbed into its vast system. Is that to be the unhappy culmination of that for which we have so long labored, so long dreamed, and prayed?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned I am not interested in attempting to take this project out of consideration in line with other projects that may be of importance, but I have a profound conviction that the Senate position on this amendment is correct and I must assert my belief in that and express, by supporting this motion, the hope that the House conferees will agree with the Senate's position.

The gentleman who preceded me, my colleague from California [Mr. GEARHART], was asked the question as to who would pay for this transmission line. A part of the answer to that question certainly is that unless this transmission line is constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation in order that we may get the power generated at this great dam to market over the people's line we shall be compelled to go through the hands of the one power company that controls and dominates all of northern and central California and we shall not be in a position to get the kind of returns upon the public investment which we ought to get.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield. Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Who is going to pay for the building of the transmission line? Will it be the people all over the country or will the cost be included in the charge to the actual consumers?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It is a charge against the project, I will say to the gentleman, to be paid back over a period of years.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Is it going to be paid back by all Americans?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. No. By those who use the power.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Or will the people who use the power pay for it?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The cost is going to be paid out of project revenues, which means of course, ultimately by the consumer.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That is what I was trying to find out.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Every dollar for the construction of this transmission line will be paid for out of the revenue derived from the sale of the electricity generated; it will not cost the rest of us a dollar.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It has been stated here, and correctly stated, that our main concern is increased farm production. A great deal of this power

is going to be required for furnishing the farms of California with the power they are going to need in their work with an additional amount available for the public power consumers, as the gentleman from Mississippi pointed out, in the city of Sacramento. In a statement made before the Senate committee by the Acting Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation he had this to say as to what would happen in case we failed to appropriate this money for this transmission line to be built by the Bureau of Reclamation.

He quoted from a report of the Senate committee of last year and said that failure to provide for the Bureau of Reclamation to build this line would amount to "The adoption of a policy which contemplates that all of the power both firm and fluctuating generated at Shasta and Bryant Dams shall be sold when produced to but one customer which is the Pacific Gas & Electric Co."

Mr. Speaker, obviously the thing to assure the proper distribution of this power is for this line to be built by the Bureau of Reclamation. Otherwise the power cannot be taken from the dam except over the lines of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., this private company. The building of this line is the only way to put this investment of the American people in this whole project on a basis where it can be conducted according to sound business principles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL].

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I would not be here except for the parliamentary situation that confronts us. Some of our colleagues are very much interested in the construction of a transmission line from the Shasta substation to Oroville, Calif., at a cost of \$1,900,000. It is one thing for you to instruct your committee today, but to adopt the amendment that is before us now is entirely another thing.

This is an enormous project estimated to cost in the final analysis \$333,665,100. There has been expended on this project as of July 1, 1943, a total of \$139,211,220.

Your House committee recommended in the beginning that the bill provide a total of \$11,500,000 for the Central Valley project containing a number of items; but if you adopt the amendment before you at this time you not only tell this committee to go back to the Senate conferees and allow the transmission line which will cost \$1,900,000 but you tell this committee to go back over there and raise the amount that you provided in your bill from \$10,500,000 to the total sum of \$28,700,000, \$4,000,300 over the Bureau of the Budget estimate as filed in the Senate.

Our bill provided for \$10,500,000. We had a Budget estimate of \$16,400,000. When the bill got to the Senate there was a supplemental Budget estimate filed over there of \$8,000,000. Mr. Speaker, they have not only allowed the total Budget estimates, but they have gone \$4,000,300 in excess of that. In order to

construct one little insignificant transmission line costing \$1,900,000 I do not believe you are going to instruct your committee to go back to conference and surrender to the tune of \$28,700,000.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRELL. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman that what I am interested in and what the Administration is interested in primarily is this transmission line and I propose to modify my amendment limiting it to that one section of the provision.

Mr. NORRELL. May I say that the President did not authorize all of this construction. The President did endorse the transmission line, but, sir, you are not only asking for the transmission line but you are asking for all of these.

May I say in conclusion and with reference to the transmission line that the evidence before our committee was that the power would be sold to a certain power company, whether the power was delivered at the Shasta substation or at Oroville, and the committee did not see how, if there was not some remuneration to the Government for the construction of the transmission line, it could go that far, but that is a matter for you to instruct us on.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may modify my amendment.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I will offer that amendment after this one, unless the pending amendment is adopted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret after many votes in favor of Central Valley to have to start in and vote against Central Valley. I think the worst thing that could happen is for this House to start taking this action now. I am in full sympathy with the whole Central Valley project and I hope the whole \$300,000,000 is finally spent; but I say to you that the Bureau of Reclamation has before the Senate an outline of a complete food program that involves many projects. The only hope for that food program to go through is for all of it to be taken together as one program.

Already we have passed an amendment relating to a project in Arizona. There remain projects in Colorado, Idaho, Oklahoma, New Mexico, Washington, and \$4,000,000 worth of small projects. We are either going to have a food program that includes the whole thing or we might as well face the possibility that we get nothing. I would a whole lot rather this House take the position that it wants to go along eventually with the Senate for a real program and not try to pick these projects out piecemeal and decide upon them in that way.

I point out also that this request for \$1,900,000 is not all by a long ways that is in this bill. There are \$28,000,000 for

this project and only \$1,900,000 of it for power lines. It is not fair for us to look at it in that way. Remember also when you talk about the consumers paying it back, they pay back for this power line, yes; but the other items in the bill involve a great deal of money, some of which comes out of the Public Treasury.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman says he is a sincere friend of the great Central Valley project.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am too, and have been from its inception. Do I understand the gentleman to say now that if the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi is voted down there will be another and better opportunity for all of these items of reclamation for production of war food to go to conference and be worked out in an orderly fashion?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Yes. I think we all recognize that the Senate conferees have been insisting that all these projects go through as one connected program for the development of the food program of this world. We realize that the United States is going to have to devote some time to food. The Senate conferees have been insisting that the entire group of projects be supported.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am in agreement with the gentleman about the food program completely, but I think the gentleman will agree with me that it is a bit confusing—at least it is to me—to understand how I am going to forward that by agreeing to a motion which, in effect, puts the House on record as insisting upon its former position, which includes none of the items.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I understand the confusion. I feel just as badly as the gentleman does, but I recognize that this motion is not going to prevail, because you cannot carry it on this sort of an appeal, to just give one thing for Central Valley for power only, when the country needs food and needs lots of food, and needs it from Oklahoma, needs it from Idaho, needs it from Colorado, and needs it from all these little projects the gentleman from Montana included.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Suppose all these amendments were included together and you were instructed to go back and still resist them. Do I understand the gentleman to say that he would now favor the \$4,000,000 appropriation?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Definitely; of course.

Mr. O'CONNOR. All of the others that are included in this?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Surely, and so do the Senate conferees.

Mr. O'CONNOR. If this is voted down, that is what the gentleman will do?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. That is what I tried to do a while ago, when I tried to loop them together, from 96 to 120.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Does the gentleman know there is a great need for war industries in California that will be served by this power?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Certainly, but I also recognize there is a project in the gentleman's State. They ought all to be taken together in an attempt to provide a well-rounded program.

I want to say in behalf of the members of the congressional delegation from California that they have been extremely fair on this project. They have not tried to crowd the thing through. I think we ought to recognize that fact. I am deeply sorry that the gentleman from Mississippi, who is solely interested in public power, should have jeopardized the food program by trying to ask for separate votes on these amendments. I say to the House that we need to try to stand together and get a decent food program. Eventually we can hope to accomplish it.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I do not know whether I quite understood the gentleman correctly. Is it his idea that if we further insist on the House position the gentleman's committee intends to compromise with the Senate on the basis of Budget estimates?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I am sorry, I am not on the committee. I simply know that the Senate conferees have taken one position on the entire group in furtherance of a program laid down by the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of Reclamation for food for this country for war.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON].

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my voice to the effort to get this money for this transmission line, and I should like to spend just a moment in answering the argument the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] just delivered.

The Central Valley water project, as the gentleman knows and as all of you know, is primarily a water project and consists of the Shasta Dam in the northern part of the Sacramento Valley, impounding the water from that valley, and by various types of works transmitting the water to the San Joaquin Valley, which has a great shortage of water but a lot of fertile land. If we build this dam up to the required height, the height provided in the re-

ports of the Army engineers and in their recommendations, we shall only then be in a position to furnish the water to the arid land in the San Joaquin Valley that will produce the foods the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the rest of us want.

The thing we must get in our minds and thoroughly understand is this: The power features of this project are only a byproduct. The main thing is to get that water transmitted from the Sacramento Valley to the other valley. The way we can make money out of this project and make it pay for itself, getting back those millions of dollars, is to allow the water on the way down to the San Joaquin Valley to pass through the power plants. We have the generators to be installed at the Keswick Dam, which is 25 miles below the Shasta Dam. By installing these and completing the Shasta Dam we will then be in a position to have water to send to the San Joaquin Valley. This water can be passed through the Keswick Dam generators, and in this way, by selling the electricity thus generated, we can get back some money to help pay for the enormous cost of this project. This will help materially to reduce the cost of the water to the growers down in the San Joaquin Valley.

Another very important reason why I am particularly interested in this project is this particular situation: In Sacramento, which is the largest city in the Sacramento Valley, they have created a public-utility district. They voted enough bonds to buy and they have condemned the distributing system of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. in the city of Sacramento and the surrounding territory, which comprises the Sacramento utility district. The price which was placed upon the distributing system by the Railroad Commission of California is within the amount of money that the utility district has. We are very anxious to have this power line go on down to Oroville, which is only 90 miles from Sacramento, and have the juice run through the public-owned line. If you do not do that, we must pass all the juice through the lines of the private power company, the P. G. & E.

Now the P. G. & E. have come there, and they state they are willing to save us a million five hundred thousand dollars, and everyone knows that a public-utility company is not out to give away a million or more dollars.

Mr. CARTER. If we turn it over to the Pacific Gas at Oroville, they still have their power there.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Oroville, yes, but I want to see the public transmission line built as near Sacramento as possible. I know that the transmission line now contemplated does not go clear to the city of Sacramento, but if it goes over halfway now we will then be in position in the near future to get it into Sacramento when the Sacramento utility district gets into operation.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. And in case this is built, it would be merely a duplication, a parallel line?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. There is no existing line now, so it will not be a duplication.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. The gentleman says that we would get the power down through private industry, if this line is not built.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. If the public line is not built, the present private utility will take the electricity down in some such circuitous way through their line. They are asking right now to build additional power lines in California.

Mr. RANKIN. If the Government does not build this line and turns it over to a private company, it will have to use the same amount of material, and if the Government does it, it gets the material without paying tribute.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. We want this program carried out in accordance with the plan of the President and the request of the Interior Department, and if we do, we will reap some of the benefits that will come from the development of this electricity as a byproduct.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Do I understand that that transmission line is to be built by the Government and brought there to private stations at Oroville, maintained by the P. G. & E., and that they in turn will distribute it to the consumer?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Yes; to the consumers or to the Sacramento utility district when its operations start.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. What is the point of the Government bringing a transmission line to a private company and having them distribute the power?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. The Interior Department does not feel that they can ask for enough money now to supply the transmission line all the way to Sacramento now, and they want to take the first step and bring it down as near as possible to the biggest block of consumers in that area, 150,000 to 200,000 people, who will be served by the Sacramento utility district, when its operations start, which will be soon.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Then, so in the final analysis the P. G. & E. Co. is getting the power brought to them, to their own distributing station, and selling it to the people.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. No; it would be sold to the Sacramento consumers by the Government, but it probably would, at first, be transmitted a part of the way from Shasta Dam to Sacramento over private wires. But ultimately it would be transmitted the entire distance over publicly owned lines. This proposed transmission line is only the first segment of the whole public transmission line.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have been sitting here listening to the debate that has been going on. Yesterday evening, just about this hour, we voted in this House \$300,000,000 to house people. What for? It was in the interest of the war effort and nothing else. And here

we are squabbling over twenty-four million or twenty-five million dollars that all goes to reclamation projects to help win the war and feed the people. I for one think it is a d— shame, and I mean just that, and I do not mean anything else. The time has come, if we are going to win this war, to face realities as they really are. We hear different ones talking about power. Some of the same Members who talked here today were not interested in power in 1939, when by record vote, they voted to turn over from the Forestry Department into the National Park System King's Canyon National Park, and when they voted that they voted to lock up a second Boulder Dam. I have heard the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] talking about power, and he was one of the boys who voted to lock up that second Boulder Dam. Here is the true picture of the situation. The money allotted here by the Bureau of the Budget, I believe properly allocated to the project, is sufficient to get all of its features started whether located on the northern end of the project or the southern end, but I say to you that we have been talking about power for all these years when we should have been talking about the production of food and to increase food production, and the only way you will increase food production is in reclamation projects all over the United States, and you will increase food production in the Central Valley and on down in the San Joaquin Valley by getting water to 285,000 acres that lie south of the Friant Dam that are thirsty for water and that will produce a million tons of foodstuffs annually. We have been talking about power, and the railroad commission in the State of California just recently issued a statement that there is a surplus of power in the State of California at the present time, and no one can deny that. I say to you about the transmission lines that are in this bill, at the present time the only people that could distribute this power to the people of California are the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. They are the only people who can buy power and use it, and they have the facilities to take care of it, and we need perhaps an additional 25 miles of line to be built.

But the P. G. & E. will build their own lines, because they have to buy the power at the Shasta substation. The Department of the Interior has offered them a contract to sell the power at the power site, and they are the only people who have bid for the power.

Mr. GEARHART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. GEARHART. I notice in this section there are \$10,640,000 for the Friant division. Is the gentleman against that?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I am for that.

Mr. GEARHART. Are you for the transmission line, \$1,900,000?

Mr. ELLIOTT. No; because we do not need them at the present time.

Mr. GEARHART. Do you realize that both of them must stand or fall on this one vote?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I know that last year the gentleman was for power and not for water for the San Joaquin Valley.

Mr. GEARHART. You know that is not true. I am talking here for irrigation and irrigation alone.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Read your remarks of last year. The question was put to you. You were asked whether you wanted power or water, and you said you would take the transmission line.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, Arizona is a neighbor of California. For many years I have watched with deep solicitude the development of the great Central Valley in my neighboring State. It is a magnificent engineering conception with which I first became acquainted while on the staff of the University of California at Berkeley 14 years ago. I am for this development as much as any Californian on this floor. I feel today, however, that it is an unfortunate motion that is before us. I believe if we will vote down the well-intentioned motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi since he may not be able to withdraw it, and if we send all this group of amendments on irrigation projects in disagreement back to conference, that the conferees, with more time and calmer judgment, will work this thing out to the advantage of all, including all these projects taken together, which will add tremendously to our food-production possibilities. From the known stand of Donald Nelson and Chester Davis on these projects, it is likely Budget estimates may yet be had on them.

I am just as much in favor of this power line, which is included, as the gentleman from Mississippi or anyone from California. I would like to see that included because it is a small but strategic part of that great project which, in its entirety, will take many, many years to complete, but which can be completed in part quickly in order to add to the food production so sadly needed at this time. Anxious as I am about this key power line, I am not willing to sacrifice all of these other food projects for this one. That is why I am opposed to the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] which might have some such adverse effect.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa, a member of the committee [Mr. JENSEN], 3 minutes.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I think it would be well to clear the atmosphere a little on this matter, so I will attempt in a short time to do that very thing.

The facts are that the P. G. & E. has contracted for all the power and all the energy that is developed at Shasta Dam, at the Shasta powerhouse. That contract carries on until 6 months after the war. The committee is willing that the Government build the line from Shasta Dam to the Shasta substation, a distance

of about 25 miles, which will cost around \$400,000. The committee is opposed to having the Government build this line from Shasta substation to Oroville, a distance of about 70 miles, at a cost of \$1,500,000.

The facts are the P. G. & E. will build that line with their own money and they are now ready to do that and furnish this power to the people who need it in California. The P. G. & E. is selling energy for about 3 cents a kilowatt. I think you will all agree that is quite reasonable.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Three cents a kilowatt for what? For domestic use or for manufacturing?

Mr. JENSEN. For domestic use.

Mr. WHITE. What about manufacturing use?

Mr. JENSEN. It is less.

Mr. WHITE. How much less?

Mr. JENSEN. I do not know exactly what it is. I do not remember now.

Mr. WHITE. Does not the gentleman think 1 cent a kilowatt for manufacturing use in our war industries is excessive when it is generated for 2½ mills a kilowatt?

Mr. JENSEN. Nobody out there is complaining about the cost of their current.

Mr. WHITE. I happen to be one of the members of an investigating committee which investigated the Hetch Hetchy and the P. G. & E. They bought power for 8 mills and retailed it for 40 mills in San Francisco, and San Francisco paid back more than they got from the P. G. & E. for the little part they used.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman. The fact of the matter is that the Government is in too much business already. If you want the Government to get into more business, all right, vote for this amendment; but if you want the Government to stay out of business and let private industry run its business, here is a chance to do it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] such time as he may desire.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on tomorrow, when we reach page 86, I intend to offer a preferential motion to recede and concur in Senate amendments 154½ to and including 160. In connection with the motion I desire to call to the attention of the Members of the House two press releases from the War Production Board. One release is dated April 29, 1943, and is as follows:

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
April 24, 1943.

Warning that "we will never have enough of anything until the war ends," H. G. Batcheller, Director of the War Production Board Steel Division, tonight pointed out that the current supply of steel is considerably less than demand, and that substantial cuts are being made in the amounts of steel requested by claimant agencies for use during the third quarter of 1943.

In a speech before the annual conference of the National Open Hearth Committee, and

the Blast Furnace and Raw Materials Committee, of the American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers in Cleveland, Ohio, Mr. Batcheller revealed the specific percentage reductions in major claimant agency requests for steel which the Steel Division has recommended to the War Production Board Requirements Committee.

Commenting on the reductions in requests for steel, Mr. Batcheller laid particular emphasis on the fact that stories and rumors to the effect that shifts in munitions production would result in a freer supply of steel, were completely untrue. They are, in fact, a direct threat to higher industrial production, he said.

Both production and distribution must be flexible enough to permit rapid shifts from one weapon to another, Mr. Batcheller declared. The problem of making enough steel of the right kind at the right time in the face of changing conditions dictated by military strategy and battlefield experience has been and will remain highly complex. This does not permit an easing of restrictions on less essential use of steel, he continued.

"If anything is certain in this war," he declared, "it is the immensity of the twin task of producing enough steel to win the war and of finding ways of distributing enough steel and other industrial products to rebuild the world and win the peace. Never before has the steel industry, and the country which it serves, faced a job so important."

Total requests by the 16 claimant agencies for the third quarter, Mr. Batcheller said, amounted to about 21,000,000 tons of finished carbon steel. Available for allocation will be approximately 15,000,000 tons.

"While I cannot give you specific tonnage figures for the individual claimant agencies, since the final decision has not yet been made by the War Production Board Requirement Committee, I can indicate to you in approximate terms the extent to which the requests for steel will have to be revised downward."

"The recommendations made to the Requirement Committee by the Steel Division, which may be adjusted slightly, give the following picture:

"The War Department's request for carbon steel to be delivered during July, August, and September of this year will have to be cut by about 14 percent. And its request for alloys will have to be trimmed by about one-sixth.

"The amount of carbon steel which the Steel Division has recommended for allocation to the Navy Department during the third quarter is 20 percent less than the stated requirement. And the Navy, like the Army, will probably have to get along with one-sixth less alloy steel during the third quarter than it requested.

"Similarly, the Steel Division has recommended a reduction of about 22 percent in Maritime Commission requests for carbon steel, 32 percent in the Lend-Lease Administration requests, and 40 percent in the Office of Defense Transportation request.

"It is difficult to make these reductions when we know that many of the requirements are not overstatements," the Steel Division Director added.

"The steel could be used in the full amounts asked for if we could provide it. The plain fact is that we cannot, and therefore must distribute the steel we have in the places that need it most.

"You can see how much happier our position would be if you gentlemen could give us more steel out of existing equipment, while at the same time doing all in your own power to bring into production the new capacity provided under the expansion program.

"The War Production Board, the Steel Division, and the steel industry do not want to interfere with the strategic objectives of any of the Government agencies which are

doing their best on all fronts—military, political, and economic—to shorten this war and bring Germany and Japan to their knees. But the available supply of steel is simply less than the well-considered claimant agency demands."

Reviewing some of the accomplishments of the steel industry under wartime pressure, Mr. Batcheller said that plate production in March had set an all-time record of 1,167,679 tons, which permitted, among other things, a record-breaking month for merchant ship production.

New production records are being made in alloy steel—the aristocrat of material for war-making—with 1,284,679 net tons produced in March "as a result of the steel industry's efforts to provide the greatest volume of the richest alloy steels available to any armed force in this war."

Complacency, however, Mr. Batcheller warned, would be a serious danger.

"Remember," he warned, "we have hardly begun to fight, to lose lives, and use steel on a major scale in either Europe or Asia, and the dangers of war do not take into account rated capacities.

"All that counts is production, more production, and still more production. That is what we need. In the Steel Division, we know that more steel production is what we will get. We know that you will not let us down."

The other release is dated June 28, 1943, and is as follows:

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
June 28, 1943.

Cooperation of 2,000 of the largest manufacturing consumers of steel is being enlisted by the Steel Division, working with the 12 War Production Board regional offices, to achieve a better distribution of third and fourth quarter production, H. G. Batcheller, director of the division, said today.

This effort—in effect, a campaign to "Share the Steel"—is one part of the drive announced yesterday by the War Production Board to obtain an extra 2,000,000 tons of steel during the last 6 months of 1943.

Steel Division officials, thoroughly familiar with steel products and steel operations, are being sent by the Washington office of the steel division to War Production Board regional offices throughout the United States. These men, aided by regional office representatives in each area, will work with consumers to see if steel supplies on hand will permit the elimination or deferment of third and fourth quarter orders on producers' books without interfering with authorized schedules.

If this move is successful, additional allotments can be authorized immediately for other war users of steel with the production space thus obtained on steel producers' books.

"This is completely a cooperative movement," Mr. Batcheller said, "and upon its success will depend in large measure the attainment of our objective of making available additional steel for the last half of this year."

"We are sending all steel producers a chart of the regional offices, and the Steel Division personnel detailed to each for the purpose of this campaign. It will be most helpful if producers send copies of the chart to their district sales offices, so that they will be able to give their best aid to the Steel Division men who will be working with consumers in their respective territories."

Mr. Batcheller, in explaining the necessity for the "Share the Steel" campaign, said that for the third quarter of 1943 the various claimant agencies presented allotment requests totaling about 23,500,000 tons of carbon and alloy steel, against an estimated supply of 16,250,000 tons. As a result, all requests had to be reduced to a considerable degree, and many of the agencies were unable to allot steel for some important programs.

"Additional steel can very profitably be used for urgent war needs if it becomes available," Mr. Batcheller said.

"Therefore, effort is being made to see that every possible ton of steel is produced during the third and fourth quarters. In addition to this, an organized campaign is being conducted to obtain the cooperation of a number of the larger steel consumers in reducing third- and fourth-quarter orders on books of producers where these orders can be eliminated or deferred without interfering with authorized programs. If this move is successful, additional allotments will be authorized immediately to provide orders for any production space thus obtained."

Senate amendment No. 160 provides \$2,750,000 for an investigation of raw material resources for steel production; whereas, the House bill appropriated only \$149,000 and the House bill restricted the investigation to a certain particular area of the country. The Senate amendment is in accord with the recommendation of the Boykin Committee, which was authorized by the House to investigate the steel shortage, and it is likewise in accord with the recommendation of the Bureau of Mines. Certainly no one will attempt to underrate the importance of the investigation sought to be provided for in the Senate amendments, and I hope that on tomorrow the House will approve my motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendments, which provide the necessary money for this very important investigation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein the two press releases referred to.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER] 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, much has been said here about the sale of this power. In fact, my colleague from California said that he wanted this power transported down to Oroville, where it would be sold. That shows a woeful lack of understanding of the present situation.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. Not now. If I have time later I will yield.

I have in my hand the proposed contract with the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. and the Department of the Interior, and it provides for the delivery and the measuring and the paying for all of this power at the substation, which is just 25 miles from the Shasta Dam.

A power line by the Government should be built from the Shasta substation to the powerhouse, to be sure. Why, Mr. Speaker, you are not building a power line for the Interior Department. You are building it for the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. and they are willing to build that power line themselves.

Section 10 of this proposed contract between the Department of the Interior and the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. provides for place of delivery of the electric power and energy contracted hereunder to be delivered to the company at its Shasta substation.

The contract provides further on that—

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I decline to yield.

Mr. GEARHART. That is not a contract; it is nothing but a piece of paper.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California declines to yield.

Mr. CARTER. I declined to yield to the gentleman and his statement is that it is not a contract. I did not say that it was a contract. I said it was a contract that they are considering at the present time and the contract will be entered into; it is the Department of the Interior's own proposal. This came from the attorneys of the Interior Department.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. And is it not a fact that the Interior Department power director said that that contract would be entered into?

Mr. CARTER. Yes; they told us when they appeared before the committee that this contract would be entered into within 3 weeks.

The question here for this House to decide today is whether or not we want to put up the money, \$1,900,000, to build a power line which, according to the terms of this contract is to be leased to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. Why, Mr. Speaker, it is ridiculous to say this power line should continue on beyond this substation. I have a map here that I regret you will be unable to see very well; some of you will be able to see it. This part of the map indicates the Shasta power plant, and the Shasta substation is about 20 miles southwest. There is indicated on the map the proposed line. The Pacific Gas & Electric Co. already has a power line running down there, and they tell me that for the greater part of the year the entire Shasta power is never going to go to Oroville, that they are going to use that line—this power line shown on the map—to bring in the power from the other substations and they cannot accept, and they made this plain to the Department of the Interior, they cannot accept delivery of all of the power at Oroville. They expect to develop 150,000 kilowatts with installation at the Shasta Dam, sometime next year. That power cannot all be transmitted over this line, and the sane, sensible, businesslike thing to do today is to let this power company build the power line and then let us just join the line across there, and a connecting line to their own transmission line and let them build, and let the Treasury of the United States be saved to the extent of \$1,900,000. Mr. Speaker, when this Central Valley project first started out it was estimated by the Department of the Interior to cost \$160,000,000. We heard the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] say a few minutes ago that it was expected now that it would cost \$325,000,000. Mr. Speaker, I happen to own property down in the part of the State that is supposed to be served by this power and I am one of those who is going to have to pay this tax. I thought that we might be able to carry a burden of \$160,000,000, but they put on

this and that and the other thing until the cost, as has been stated here, is now to be \$325,000,000.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California 3 additional minutes.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. The contract which the gentleman from California has referred to, of course, was made because there was no transmission line over which you could deliver the power, over which the juice could be sent; that was why it was entered into, was it not?

Mr. CARTER. This is the contract which is pending right now.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I know; but the basis of the discussion for the contract is because they have no line over which the energy could be transmitted now.

Mr. CARTER. Under the terms of this contract the Department of the Interior wants to build this transmission line.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. That is the reason back of it, is it not?

Mr. CARTER. Then they want to turn it over to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., according to the terms of the contract.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. How do they propose to connect with the Sacramento transmission?

Mr. CARTER. They can bring it down either route.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi for the purpose of withdrawing a motion.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my motion and offer another motion, which I have sent to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi withdraws his motion.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CARTER. I should like to inquire whether or not under the rules of the House the gentleman has the right to withdraw a motion should such action be objected to.

The SPEAKER. In the House that may be done.

The Clerk will report the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RANKIN moves to recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 110 with an amendment to strike out "\$11,500,000" and insert "\$15,374,000," of which \$1,900,000 shall be available for the construction of the Shasta-Oroville transmission line and terminal facility.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. As I understood the reading of the amend-

ment it was to strike out \$11,500,000. I do not know where in the Senate amendment there are such figures as \$11,500,000. I am unable to find them in the Senate amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. The Senate amendment was to strike out \$11,500,000 and insert \$15,374,000. I am following the Senate amendment exactly down to the point that involves this Shasta transmission line.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion may be again reported.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will again read the motion.

The Clerk again read the motion.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the amendment cannot possibly be considered because there is no \$11,500,000. That has been stricken by the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Senate struck out the figures \$11,500,000 and inserted the language quoted in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. My motion includes the language of the Senate amendment down to and including the word "facility" in line 12.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CARTER. Do I understand that the gentleman from Mississippi is attempting to strike something out of the bill that was stricken out in the Senate?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has held and now holds that the gentleman from Mississippi has made a proper motion.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I will take these 2 minutes to explain again that this is for the construction of the transmission line. I do not care what the contract that was submitted showed, I have a letter from the President saying that this proposition is necessary. There is more involved than the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER] indicates.

This line ought to be built and it ought to be built now, for then, as the President has said in his letter, it will be a part of that great project to be used for the benefit of the people of that section of the country for all time to come.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

I withdraw the motion, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, as a Californian, naturally I would jump at an opportunity of getting some more money, but I want to have some respect from my colleagues who are on this subcommittee.

After a very severe fight in the subcommittee they were willing to permit but \$11,500,000 to go into this bill. One of the arguments they used against me was that the Bureau of Reclamation had a \$12,000,000 carry-over. They said that if additional sums could be justified they would be willing to grant them. So I am going to go back into conference and see if I cannot persuade my colleagues to increase the sum and take my chances along with the rest of the boys.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I promised the gentleman from Idaho 2 minutes. I now yield to him.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 42, noes 138.

So the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is now on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a motion to reconsider the various votes will be laid on the table.

There was no objection.

REPORT ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 145

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be given until midnight to file a report on House Joint Resolution 145.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McGRANERY]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the Record.)

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a letter written to me and my answer to it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. ROWE (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), for 3 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. STEVENSON (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

To Mr. MAGNUSON, for 10 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. DREWRY, for 1 week, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous special order of the House, the gentleman

from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would not address the House at this late hour and I ask that that time be not insisted upon by the audience.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous special order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

OUR FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE], who got quite up in the air some months ago about the question of air supremacy, has now broadened her caustic comments to take in the whole field of foreign affairs. In a prepared speech delivered here a few days ago, she condemned the President and the State Department for not having a foreign policy, coined for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some rather startling new words, and made the front pages of the newspapers across the Nation. Unlike another new Member here who has offered in short and sufficient prose what may be one of our first steps toward post-war peace organization, the delightful gentlewoman has enshrouded her thoughts in a maze of beautifully constructed, though contradictory, sentences and left us dizzy in our mental effort to follow her around the circle. We—as she—always met ourselves coming back.

I had the pleasure of hearing only the latter part of the gentlelady's eloquent speech last Thursday, else I should have been constrained to say a few words then in my puzzlement. But next day when the Record came from the press I, always delighting in the gentlewoman's clever vocabulary, read her whole talk very carefully only to find myself more confused than ever as to what path she follows in her search for the end of the rainbow where rests international cooperation and everlasting peace.

The gentlewoman took care to read to us the ordinary Webster's Collegiate Dictionary definition of the good, simple, homely, understandable word "policy." But she confused us by adding to her list of brain children the words "globlindness" and "globalliances" which do not appear in any dictionary. This list, which began when she spoke of "globaloney" in her maiden effort here, continues to grow with the addition of "WPAism," "poppa-fix-ism," "mama-do-good-ism," and "dazzledust." Mr. Speaker, statesmanship has a new language. Unconcernedly she adds in her address:

It is the trick of politicians in high places today to raise a terrible dust of words * * * and then to complain that the people do not see.

Imagine the gentlewoman, of all people, charging anyone with raising a dust of words. She reminded us that "the Greeks invented the painless trick of the maze to drive ordinary men insane."

May I make so bold as to say to the charming lady that she has invented a maze of words which will most surely drive ordinary men mad should they make the futile effort to harmonize and

interpret them. With the genius of the accomplished playwright she is, she in her story led us through the labyrinth of her thoughts and held us in suspense awaiting a logical conclusion. Then she left us with no key to the puzzle she had made.

My first difficulty in attempting to understand the gentlewoman's global thinking came some weeks ago when she championed United States "sovereignty of the skies"—applying, of course, to our own territory—as against "freedom of the air" over every nation. Her argument as to the air may have been well and good had she not blithely tripped through her speech with no indicated understanding of the fact that air traffic is controlled by airports and not primarily by the air above them. She did not apply this principle to our interests. If she had she would have come to the inescapable realization that since Great Britain has air bases all over the world, some built with lend-lease funds, and the United States has not, a policy of air freedom would benefit the United States more than Britain.

As I have remarked, the theme of the lady's address is condemnation—of persons and policies. She condemns both isolationists whom she calls "unconverted interventionists" and interventionists whom she calls "renegade isolationists." She takes her own post in the vast no-man's land of the in-between.

In a breath, the gentlewoman condemns the Neutrality Act of the prewar period and the President for signing it. She well knows, though, that when the act was passed, 99 percent of the people of the United States wanted to stay out of war and that meant neutrality. The President in signing the act and following the will of the people was only doing what she said in her speech last week a President should do. In that address she said:

In foreign affairs, as in all else, it is for the President of the United States to be the servant of the people, not their master, and certainly not their Delphic oracle.

I am led to believe from the remarks the gentlewoman herself made in a political speech to the Republicans of Wisconsin the other day that she herself would have voted for the Neutrality Act had she been here.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Mrs. LUCE. Will the gentleman be good enough to quote the words in which I said I would have voted for the Neutrality Act in case I had been here? I do not think the gentleman will find those words.

Mr. RICHARDS. I did not say that. I beg the gentlewoman's pardon. I stated it was indicated from her speech in Wisconsin. I am going to quote what the gentlewoman said in Wisconsin, according to the Washington Herald of Monday. If the Washington Herald and some of the other newspapers are mistaken, it is their mistake and not mine. I am sure the lady, who has had a large

experience in the publishing field, knows that newspapers in quoting speeches of this kind are usually correct. This is what the gentlewoman said:

If an isolationist is or was a man who wanted to stay out of the war, then I was and am an isolationist.

Although I had often heard that the gentlewoman from Connecticut belonged to the interventionist group, she indicated in her remarks in Wisconsin that she belonged with the great majority of Americans who wanted to stay out of war—before Pearl Harbor. She was quoted as saying:

If an isolationist is or was a man who wanted to stay out of the war, then I was and am an isolationist, and so I believe was everybody in the United States before Pearl Harbor.

The lady has thus added to our bewilderment as to what she really stands for.

It is true that the Congresswoman says that she supports the Fulbright resolution. So do I. However, she certainly is out of tune with the obvious when she intimates that the President and the State Department do not look with favor on the principles embodied in this resolution. Into the speech, adding her endorsement to this move, the gentlewoman has injected a bitter, partisan tone which heretofore has been omitted from our discussions of this momentous step in our foreign policy. This resolution was not offered as expressing the sentiment of either party, but as expressing the wishes of the people. To date our talk of peace here has not been divided by this aisle, and there was no division in the committee which unanimously approved this resolution. The gentlewoman knows well enough that had this resolution come here as a proposal from the President and not through the independent channels of the House, the membership on the left-hand side of the aisle would have decried it as an effort on the part of the administration to dictate to the legislative branch and a desire to involve us forever in affairs from which we could better absent ourselves. The battle between the two parties then would have been on. The President and the Secretary of State know well enough that such a measure has its best chance of succeeding here if it comes offered as a free expression of the will of the people.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mrs. LUCE. Would the gentleman care to make a free expression on the floor of this House about how he feels about an Anglo-American alliance?

Mr. RICHARDS. If the gentlewoman will just wait a minute or two, I shall try to touch on that.

The gentlewoman declares that all the other nations—European and Asiatic—have foreign policies and why therefore cannot we have one? She does not speak of the difficulty of maintaining a definite and clear-cut foreign policy under the form of government we have. She does not say that any effective foreign policy must be supported by treaties

with foreign governments and that such treaties must be ratified by the Senate. She does not say that the minority party seeks always some broad surface in which to bore holes and scuttle any policy which an administration offers. The story is too well known for me to argue further here the cause of the League of Nations, but history will testify eternally that this Nation under the great Democrat Wilson had and tried to carry out the first concrete plan to preserve the peace of the world. And history tells too that organized opposition comprised chiefly of members of the opposition party in the Senate shattered his dream and the dream of the world.

The gentlelady says quite positively that we have no foreign policy. Then contrariwise she says that we have adopted the foreign policy of Britain, with whose interests she says ours are inseparably tied. She even grudgingly admits that that course was right insofar as self-defense at least was concerned.

Britain at least, she concedes then, has a foreign policy. And she says:

I do not for one minute object to Great Britain's pursuing her own interests with vigor and selfishness so long as she is threatened and the world is threatened by the possibility of recurrent American isolation. * * * So long as high officials of this Government continue to make windy words and sentiments and vague principles such as the four freedoms, a substitute for the hard but patriotic business of statesmanship, Great Britain cannot do otherwise.

The lady does not care to mention that the "four freedoms" are supposed to be the basis of Britain's foreign policy now and that Churchill was joint enunciator of those principles. And she perhaps has forgotten what she said in her first speech here:

Let us pity and not condemn Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill that they find themselves, like us, floundering in a sea of uncertainty. Let us try to understand that in such a situation they have no choice but to indulge in monumental generalities and noble catch-alls like the Atlantic Charter and virtuous platitudes like the "four freedoms."

She contends that the President and Secretary of State have made mistakes, and she cries out for mortals who cannot err to guide us. Let me emphasize that she said on this floor that America wants men who have a positive foreign policy and—

Cannot possibly make a mistake about a thing as serious to the United States as the passage of the Neutrality Act.

O perfect man, who cannot possibly make a mistake, float not forever on the far horizon, remain not forever in the dream of the enthusiast, dwell not forever in the song of the poet, but come and make thy home among the children of men.

Finally the gentlewoman espouses a military alliance with Great Britain. The following are her words:

I believe that the American foundation stone of American foreign policy ought to be a military alliance or nonaggression pact with Britain.

Surely the gentlewoman does not suggest that this alliance should be proposed

now by the President, because a little further along in her speech she says:

We cannot enter into a basic alliance with the British Empire if to do so would provoke the reasonable enmity or of suspicion of other peoples such as the Russians and the Chinese.

Is it not reasonable to say that such an alliance with Great Britain at the present time would without doubt create certain suspicions in the minds of the Russians and Chinese and possibly others of the United Nations?

Only a few weeks ago the gentlewoman said on the floor of this House:

There is a vast area of specific war and peace aims which can never be clarified, stated, or proposed, and certainly not enjoin upon the world until we know what goes on in the mind of Joseph Stalin. * * * Not until we know whether we are to meet and confer with iron-hearted Stalin or like-minded men on the Vistula, or on the Rhine, or on the Seine, or at the Great Wall of China, or on the Yellow River, or in Tokyo, can we or our allies realistically plan a post-war world.

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I gladly yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. LUCE. When that speech about what went on in the mind of Stalin was delivered on the floor of this House it was before I had seen the picture called *Mission to Moscow*.

Mr. RICHARDS. May I ask the gentlewoman, since she has seen that picture, has she changed her mind?

Mrs. LUCE. No, but since I have seen that picture I am under the impression that the President, who gave it his approval, did know what went on in the mind of Stalin. He and Mr. Joseph Davies seemed to know perfectly well what was going on, on the basis of which, perhaps, they could form a foreign policy toward Russia. Unless, of course, the picture itself were untruthful?

Mr. RICHARDS. Then if the gentlewoman found out from that picture that the President and the Secretary of State know what is going on in the mind of Stalin, possibly from that picture her mind was enlightened also as to what is going on in the mind of Stalin. Does the gentlewoman contend or admit that she knows what is going on in the mind of the silent man in the Kremlin today? (The gentlewoman does not answer.)

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DIES. I have a great deal of respect for the gentleman. He is a most able Member of the House. We have heard a great deal about foreign policy. Does not the gentleman believe that the foreign policy of this country will be determined by the boys who come back from the battle fronts and not by us who are here?

Mr. RICHARDS. Emphatically.

According to the gentlewoman's own words, it would not be wise for the United States to move far in the international alliance field during the progress of this war until we know what Stalin and other

Allied leaders seek to accomplish for their own nations after this war is won. Has the gentlewoman now access to the thoughts of the silent man in the Kremlin and the aims of those who rule or tomorrow will rule the banks of the Vistula and the Rhine and the Seine and the Great Wall and the Yellow River and the Japanese Empire?

Like the gentlewoman, I am in favor of the Fulbright resolution. I am in favor of international cooperation. But I am not in favor of an alliance with Great Britain on the basis of the Churchill doctrine—"We will hold what we have." The lady well knows that any successful international cooperative body to preserve the peace must include other nations beside Great Britain and must be founded on a basis of give and take. If, on that basis, Great Britain will enter such a world body alongside the United States after this war is won, it will be a success. If the Empire proposes, as has been her custom, to dominate such a body, the wishful dream of the predominant majority of our people will never materialize.

It is noted that the gentlewoman was generous enough to admit that the administration has established a definite foreign policy insofar as the Western Hemisphere is concerned. She might well have said too that this good-neighbor policy of the President and Secretary Hull has cemented the peacetime ties of friendship between us and our South American and Central American neighbors tighter than they have ever been before. It also has borne rich fruits for us in this war as it has brought to our side many smaller nations that would not be there were it not for this policy. May I add that in establishing this policy the President and Secretary of State had to overcome various antagonisms brought about by the foreign policy of preceding Republican administrations.

We then—by the gentlewoman's generous admission—have a Western Hemisphere policy. But, she says, our foreign thinking stops at the water's edge. The millions who have sons abroad welding our foreign policy into actions do not think so. And neither do I. Our foreign policy toward Europe and Asia today is one known to all and which—unlike the lady's speeches—all can comprehend. It is a two-edged sword held up between us and the totalitarian darkness. For our allies it promises friendship and assistance. For our enemies it has but one message: unconditional surrender. For all the world it offers hope. Nothing further can be added now nor needs to be. To adopt now a policy of post-war alliance with Great Britain or any other single power could only engender suspicion in the minds of other nations fighting in the common cause. The Fulbright resolution—itsself as simple and direct as our fight-and-befriend policy—should be taken up now and passed by this House. Not at the dictates of the President, as an administration policy, but as the spontaneous, concrete, and unanimous opinion of the Foreign Affairs Committee of this House. It commits us only to a course to which we and all other nations

can subscribe. We have, in fact, war alliances now in effect with all the nations of the world who, like us, oppose the Axis. To support them we have pooled all our resources, including the blood of our people. In fairness to these allies and in consideration of our own vital interests, the people of this country cannot afford now to perfect further alliances with any one nation. The people are, however, emphatically in favor of the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and maintain a just and lasting peace among the nations of the world.

Those words, "a just and lasting peace," have mocked us through the years and grown dull and trite with indiscriminate and wishful use. Now again we stand at a point from which—if we follow the straight path of realism instead of chasing will-o'-the-wisps of fancy—we may renew their meaning.

Mr. Speaker, may I, in closing, say to the versatile and brilliant gentlewoman from Connecticut that if she really wishes to see the Fulbright resolution passed by this House, if she really believes that the United States should initiate a program of international cooperation to insure a just and lasting peace, then it would be better, far better, for the gentlewoman not to reopen here old partisan wounds as to mistakes made in years gone by; for after all both Democrats and Republicans are only human and have made mistakes. Now we are all fighting together for the existence of the Nation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial from the *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the *Record* and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 15 minutes.

HENRY FORD—80 YEARS OLD

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, to live fourscore years is an honor. To live honorably for 80 years is a distinction. To live nobly and usefully for 80 years is an achievement. We know many men who are old, and by custom we respect them. Some men are old at 50, either in mind or body, but to live 80 years and still retain the vigor of youth and the vision of the prophets is the reward for sobriety, moderation, and following Divine guidance.

He has broken his lance in defense of truth, yet with unflinching courage has caught up another and charged on. When all about him was chaos and the day seemed lost, he forged order out of

that chaos. When his adversary thought he had been defeated, he arose again to make victory certain. Now, in the closing days of his eightieth year, he endured a great personal loss—the passing of his only son—yet he stood erect and bore that sorrow with a fortitude earned out of his own experience. This is Henry Ford.

Our Nation's history is a story of the deeds of great men. Out of every crisis has risen a great leader, but we are often so blinded by the crisis that we cannot see the leader until his days are done. We live on the rising and falling tides of the present while he bridges the flood alone, leaving a path for those who follow. Because he had vision, we call him great. What makes a man great? A beloved American poet found the answer in this message from a father to his son:

How big was Alexander, Pa,
That people called him great?
Was he like old Goliath, tall
His spear a hundredweight?

Was he so large that he could stand
Like some tall steeple high,
And while his feet were on the ground
His hands could touch the sky?

Oh, no, my child, about as large
As I or Uncle James
'Twas not his stature made him great,
But greatness of his name.

Stature does not make a man great. In that matchless volume of ageless literature, the Bible, we read that:

There were giants in the earth in those days.

These were physical giants. Goliath was one of them, but he was destroyed by a boy who had a new idea. There also were in those days giants of vision. They charted the course their weaker brothers could follow. The ideas born in their minds were not plans for destruction but for progress, and because they succeeded they were called prophets.

There are giants in the earth in these days too, and because they succeed and do good we call them great. Such a man is Henry Ford, but to call him a prophet would be displeasing to him. To call him a giant would be a travesty on his physical stature. But to call him great does not do justice to his record. We must instead look upon him as a tradition, because as long as men travel, as long as men and machines combine their energies to produce the things people need from the soil or in the factory, there will always be the tradition of Henry Ford.

Born a humble man who acquired but a meager education, he has never lost the common touch. Every thought he has had from the time he first conceived a new form of transportation until this moment when he is looking to the future, has been for the betterment of what we know as the common man.

That he has accumulated wealth through his genius is only incidental. Mr. Ford is a wealthy man, but the greatness of his wealth consists of the good he has done and is doing. He has always used his wealth to better the lot of his fellow men. As one who has known him personally these many years

and has resided all his life in the vicinity where Mr. Ford lives, I can say that the good he has done for untold multitudes will never be fully known until he walks with us no more. There has never been a time when he has used his wealth to gain the power wealth can bring. He has not wanted power. His thought has been to use wealth as a raw material out of which men and women can receive the necessities of life, and in view of his deep spiritual convictions, it is only natural that his attitude toward wealth has been patterned after a portion of the old Psalm:

Therefore I love the Commandments above gold, yea above fine gold.

I wish I could tell you what Mr. Ford has in his mind as he looks into the future. To do so would be to take on the mantle of the prophet. But no man will have that pleasure, for only Henry Ford knows what path the Henry Ford tradition will follow next. What those who know him can tell you is that the mind of this genius is looking 10, 15 and 20 years beyond the war. He is looking at the peace he loves when men will live by the fruits of their labors and when the strength of nations will be measured by the alms they share rather than by the arms they bear.

But while the nations are at war, there is no man who will give or who has given more of his knowledge and resources to win the struggle and the peace than Henry Ford. He hates war, but he hates tyranny more. In order that the men who wear the uniform of our country may be better equipped to achieve success, preserve a government of freedom and justice, and return safely to their homes, he is trying to build the safest tank, the most powerful airplane engine, and the best bomber in the world.

To speed that day Mr. Ford has given an empire to his government. It began in an alley barn. It was born of a small gasoline motor that later became the heart of a horseless carriage. It grew into the automobile and around it has grown the greatest expanse of an industry the world has ever known. Standing alone in the midst of this great productive force is the monument to Mr. Ford's genius—the Ford Motor Co. with its far-flung plants and vast sources of raw materials. This great enterprise is now pledged completely to the war effort from the single soybean in the laboratory to the massive slabs of white-hot steel that will soon be shaped into weapons.

Mr. Ford believed that he had completed the active period of his life with his company and that he could withdraw into the silent recesses of his experimental laboratories to lay the foundation stones of a better future for men. But, "Man proposes while God disposes," and the Almighty in His wisdom removed his only son whom he trusted implicitly to carry on the Ford tradition. There was no one to fill the vacant chair, so at four-score years and for the second time he assumed the presidency of his company. That he must pilot this vast dominion through the greatest war in history when once before he thought he had helped

arm the Nation for a war to end all wars, is tragedy heaped on tragedy.

Time has dealt kindly with Henry Ford. He is as alert and vigorous today, hastening from one war machine to another, as he was those many years ago when he and Mrs. Ford bolted an old water pipe and flywheel to the kitchen sink and made a gasoline motor.

The years are rolling swiftly over the muddled seas of circumstance in our time, but after them follows an ever-widening wake of confidence. The dark hours have passed and the dawn is near. When the full light of victory throws off the mantle of death and destruction, there will be giants standing there in our day as in the days of the prophets. Among them will stand the quiet man from Bagley Avenue, Detroit, who tinkered at his lathe, made a motor run, and changed the course of empires.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. Yes.

Mr. SADOWSKI. I think the gentleman has expressed the feelings of every good Detroit, of every good citizen of the city of Detroit, in what he has said here this afternoon about that other important citizen of our city. He is a man we all respect and hold very highly. He is a man who has been able in the Second World War to come out and make a great contribution again that will add greatly to the victory that will be ours. I only wish the gentleman had also expressed the fact that it was Henry Ford, when he was struggling to put over this great automobile program, who won a great fight with the Wall Street interests that tried to strangle him just when he was getting on his feet. For the first time that anyone was able to do it, he defeated the Wall Street interests and was able to show to the rest of the industrialists that he was greater than the financiers of that great district.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman has made a beautiful and proper tribute, one much deserved, to a great man. I could not add to it if I wished. I feel, however, that this thought is pertinent, that the duty we have before us in this day and hour is to retain an economic system that will make possible more Henry Fords.

Mr. DONDERO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CHENOWETH. May I congratulate the gentleman for his eloquent and beautiful tribute to a really great American.

Mr. DONDERO. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. Voorhis] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my special order may be put over until Monday next in case the House is still in session at that time.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 20 minutes.

FREEDOM FROM WANT

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I am using, as the basis of my discussion this afternoon, one of the President's "four freedoms," freedom from want. The American people face a serious situation in my opinion with regard to the production, distribution, and supply of food. Unless the supply of food is substantially increased, and a more satisfactory plan of distribution adopted in the near future, the food problem will be critical. It seems obvious that a policy of rolling back retail food prices supported by subsidy payments from the Federal Treasury will not solve the question. This does not mean we should not have ceilings where they are needed to prevent runaway prices but subsidies will not increase the supply of food which, after all, is the most important thing. Neither will subsidies bring about a better distribution or prevent inflation. I believe that payment of hundreds of million of dollars in subsidies to roll-back prices on a few rationed food items will not cut down to any appreciable amount the cost of living for the average consumer. Our people should understand that funds used for payment of subsidies to reduce the cost of foods will, after all, be paid in bonds and future taxes that will be charged to our children, our grandchildren, as well as to the soldiers abroad; because this generation will never be able to pay a very great share of the huge indebtedness that is being incurred now.

Mr. Speaker, in order to have freedom from want, the most important need is a program and policy that will encourage and provide for a maximum production and supply of food. Provision must be made whereby this supply is fairly and equitably distributed. Mr. Speaker, I think we have learned from our recent experience that all activities dealing with production and distribution of food, as well as of price adjustment and control of food should be placed under one head with power and authority to carry out a definite, well-organized, well-rounded and far-reaching program. We are advised that there are about nine agencies in our Government with divided authority attempting to deal with the question of production and distribution and control of food. There ought to be one agency with final authority to determine these questions.

Mr. Speaker, it must be recognized that food is one of the most important factors in our war program. There must be a greater realization on the part of officials in high places that the farmer and the producer are among the most important of our war workers and they should be placed on a level of recognition with men and women engaged in other industries contributing directly to the prosecution of the war. It has been said that a vehicle must run on all four wheels. The production of food is one of the most important of those wheels.

The farmer must be assured, beginning right now, that he will have an adequate supply of farm machinery, equipment, repairs and other things that contribute to increased production. He must be relieved of the many controls and rules and regulations and red tape that are hampering and slowing him down. Furthermore, those who are responsible for the administration of such program and those who act in an advisory capacity must be individuals with broad, practical experience in dealing with food production and distribution. In my judgment, we have too many theorists and experimenters dealing with this problem. This is a most important task.

We should be reminded that, after all, the farmer gets less than 50 percent of the amount paid for food by the ultimate consumer. With reference to a good many food items, he gets as little as 10 percent. The remainder, of course, goes into processing, marketing, transportation, wholesale, and retail expenses. When you think in terms of prices at the corner grocer, remember the amount you pay is not the amount that goes to the man who produces the food. Let me remind you also that in my community, and likewise throughout the country, farmers are working 12, 14, 16 hours a day in the hot summer weather in an attempt to meet the demand for increased supply of food not only for our armed forces and ourselves but for people in other parts of the world as well. It is not only the head of the family that is doing this work but also mother and all the children who have not gone to war. They are on the job from sunrise until sunset. The situation on the farm is much different from what is found in our cities where people work definite hours and then have hours for relaxation and amusements. As a general rule you will find the farmer stays pretty close to his task and that he is doing his work under a lot of handicaps and without a lot of conveniences that are afforded folks in other lines of work. My appeal this afternoon is not to give the farmers or any other group any advantages to which they are not entitled as individuals, but we had better make sure that no stone is left unturned to see that the great food producers of our country are given a chance to do everything possible to meet the challenge of preventing a scarcity of food in this country. Let us see to it, so far as we are concerned, that our obligations with respect to this problem are fully discharged.

Mr. Speaker, we need a definite and constructive farm policy. That policy should be part of an over-all food program coordinated with our domestic and foreign program. Our food production and distribution program must be examined from the standpoint of seeing to it that our production and distribution shall be at the very maximum that can be done by the people of this country. Right now the farmers of America are producing far more food per capita than anywhere else in the whole world. That production, in view of the demands of the present, as well as of the future, will have to be increased.

Mr. Speaker, the farmer is entitled to receive for his products a price based on the cost of production when compared with the things he is required to buy in order to maintain a fair standard of living. Retail price ceilings should be regulated at a place where a farmer can afford to produce at the maximum of his efforts taking into account labor and other costs, and sufficient to stimulate and not hamper production. The farmer is not demanding excessive or run-away prices for his products.

Mr. Speaker, rationing of food should be done only in accordance with the supply that can be obtained under such rationing program. It should be at a balance of consumption with production and should not be higher than the available supply of the products rationed. Those in charge of the food program should see to it that the foods are equitably distributed and as far as possible economically handled so that no advantage will be taken of the consumer.

Mr. Speaker, let me repeat that in my judgment a maximum production of farm products, including grains, dairy products, meats, and other foods, will do more to help defeat inflationary conditions in this country than any other proposal that can be offered. Certainly, we must ration food wherever necessary. Fix retail ceilings when and where required, but, above all things, stimulate the production and flow of food with a minimum of regulations, Executive orders, and requirements of various kinds.

Mr. Speaker, those in power and authority ought to work over, reexamine, and simplify the entire food situation. Then they should inaugurate a food production, distribution, and control program in line with the suggestions I have just made. Such program and policy should be carried out with practical judgment and common sense. An appeal should be made to the American people for their cooperation. They should be given to understand that it is a definite part of an over-all program in bringing this war to a victorious conclusion and of winning the peace thereafter. The results will be farther reaching, in my opinion, than they are now. We must have an over-all food policy. The American people must know about such policy and have sufficient interest and confidence in it to help carry it out.

Mr. Speaker, before closing, I want to pay my respect to Hon. Chester Davis, who recently resigned his position as Food Administrator. Mr. Davis was a capable, conscientious public servant. I regret very much that he deemed it wise to take such action.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1130. An act to provide for care of children of mothers employed in war areas in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly

enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2536. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment," approved June 1, 1920, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2869. An act to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2996. An act making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 832. An act relating to the sale of horse meat or food products thereof in the District of Columbia.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2536. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment," approved June 2, 1920, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2869. An act to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2996. An act making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, July 2, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands at 10 a. m., Friday, July 2, 1943, for the purpose of considering H. R. 2596, to protect naval petroleum reserve No. 1, and such other matters as may properly come before the committee.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

528. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers reported to him for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government, to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

529. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting estimates of personnel requirements for the quarter ending September 30, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

530. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting the estimates of personnel

requirements for the Post Office Department, for the quarter ending September 30, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

531. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report of investigation of the contracts and other records of the United States Maritime Commission and the Navy Department relative to the sale of five vessels to the Baltimore Mail Steamship Co., under agreement dated July 11, 1930; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McGRANERY: Committee on Ways and Means. House Joint Resolution 145. Joint resolution to extend the provisions of the Bituminous Coal Act of 1937 until January 1, 1944; without amendment (Rept. No. 641). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PITTINGER: Committee on Claims. S. 332. An act for the relief of Velma Pikkarainen; without amendment (Rept. No. 624). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio: Committee on Claims. S. 346. An act for the relief of Harriet B. Rickards; without amendment (Rept. No. 625). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 247. A bill for the relief of Richard P. Beale and Eva M. Beale; with amendment (Rept. No. 626). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio: Committee on Claims. H. R. 273. A bill for the relief of Lt. Comdr. Walter H. Schwartz (Medical Corps), United States Navy; with amendment (Rept. No. 627). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio: Committee on Claims. H. R. 383. A bill for the relief of Robert A. Hudson; with amendment (Rept. No. 628). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SAUTHOFF: Committee on Claims. H. R. 400. A bill for the relief of Sigurd J. E. Wallstedt; with amendment (Rept. No. 629). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 938. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Robert C. Anderson; with amendment (Rept. No. 630). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARSON of Ohio: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1665. A bill for the relief of Joseph Paste, Anna Paste, Rose Paste, and to the legal guardian of Doris Paste, and to the legal guardian of Evelyn Paste; without amendment (Rept. No. 631). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1769. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ina Mae Shipman; with amendment (Rept. No. 632). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTINGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1887. A bill for the relief of Harold E. Dalton; with amendment (Rept. No. 633). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOODWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1915. A bill for the relief of Carl W. Bucey; with amendment (Rept. No. 634). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1918. A bill for the relief of Edward A. Silvia; with amendment (Rept. No. 635). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTINGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1920. A bill for the relief of Marcus O. and Faye D. Rowland, the parents of George L. Rowland, deceased; with amendment (Rept. No. 636). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1962. A bill for the relief of Daniel D. O'Connell and Almon B. Stewart; with amendment (Rept. No. 637). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SAUTHOFF: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2244. A bill for the relief of Frank and Nancy Foglia, parents of Frank Foglia, a minor, deceased; with amendment (Rept. No. 638). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SAUTHOFF: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2915. A bill for the relief of the Pacific Construction Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 639). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3091. A bill relating to challenges in the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3092. A bill to establish the method of selection of jurors in district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3093. A bill to establish standards for selection of jurors to serve in the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 3094. A bill relating to employment and reemployment benefits of members of the armed forces; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. PAGÁN:

H. R. 3095. A bill to increase the compensation of employees of the United States in the Territory of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 3096. A bill to amend title 2, chapter 1, section 2a (a), as amended, relating to apportionment and number of Representatives; to the Committee on the Census.

H. R. 3097. A bill to amend title 2, chapter 1, section 2a (a) and section 2b, as amended, relating to apportionment and number of Representatives; to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. Res. 283. Resolution authorizing the printing of 43,500 extra copies of the historical record of "America's Fighting Congress"; to the Committee on Printing.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to withdraw and restore to their previous status under the control of the Territory certain Hawaiian home lands required for use for airplane landing fields; to the Committee on the Territories.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CRAVENS:

H. R. 3098. A bill for the relief of Dr. H. H. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GREGORY:

H. R. 3099. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. R. F. Claud; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 3100. A bill for the relief of Pan American Airways, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 3101. A bill for the relief of George E. O'Loughlin; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3102. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eva M. Delisle; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1828. By SCHUETZ: Resolution of the House of Representatives of the Sixty-third General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, that we respectfully request the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as may be necessary to afford a reasonable opportunity to every member of the military forces of the United States to cast a ballot in national elections, at least insofar as candidates will be voted for by an entire State; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

1829. By Mr. BROWN of Ohio: Petition of Lena L. Jones and 320 other citizens of Clark County, Ohio, favoring the passage of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1830. By Mr. GILLETTE: Resolution adopted by City Council of Williamsport, Pa., favoring the continuance of the National Youth Administration center in Lycoming County, Pa.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1831. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of Nettie Haworth and 44 other citizens of Tonganoxie and McLouth, urging the enactment of House bill 2082, for by its enactment untold amounts of money, food materials, coal, iron, rubber, gasoline, and shipping space will be conserved, and a large percentage of the cause of absenteeism in war plants will be eliminated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1832. By the SPEAKER. Petition of Hiram A. Spry, of Munith, Mich., petitioning consideration of the resolution with reference to compensation in connection with the loss of his leg due to causes arising out of service in the United States Navy in 1918; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1833. Also, petition of the Massachusetts State Federation of Women's Clubs, Boston, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to world peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1834. Also, petition of the American Stock Yards Association of Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the price of livestock and the ceilings of meat; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1835. Also, petition of the Sons of the Revolution in the State of New York, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to our country in defense of

their flag and all it represents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1836. Also, petition of Lucille J. Butler, of Payson, Utah, petitioning consideration of the resolution with reference to the equal rights amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JULY 2, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in the dedication of this quiet moment at the beginning of the day we would that all voices be stilled that Thine may be heard. Show us the false glamour of things that too often deceive with their gaudy glitter. O Thou who art the life and the light, dawn upon our darkened minds; make us pure in heart, in motive, in thought, in action, that we may see God and the godlike everywhere.

Save us from being driven by the logic of our minds to a mere belief in Thee and yet living our days in spiritual poverty, oblivious to those deep streams of eternal help where the soul is refreshed and made sufficient for the evil of the day. As servants of the Commonwealth may we be diligent enough to seek the truth, honest enough to follow the gleam wherever it may lead, brave enough to proclaim it and defend it even though men may revile us and persecute us and say all manner of evil against us falsely. May all life, private and public, be to us as a sacrament. Make Thou our bodies Thy temples and our hearts Thy altars where the sacred flame is ever burning. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, July 1, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. McGill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2935) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19 to the bill; and concurred therein with an amendment; that the House insisted upon its amendment to Senate amendment numbered 19; that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 24

and 30 to the bill; asked a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. HARE, Mr. TARVER, Mr. THOMAS of Texas, Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. KEEFE, and Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the further conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 144) relating to the marketing of burley and flue-cured tobacco under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the bill (S. 832) relating to the sale of horse meat or food products thereof in the District of Columbia, and it was signed by the Vice President.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 144) relating to the marketing of burley and flue-cured tobacco under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letter, which were referred as indicated:

DEFICIENCY ESTIMATES OF APPROPRIATIONS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (S. Doc. No. 90)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting deficiency estimates of appropriations for the District of Columbia, fiscal year 1943, in the amount of \$70,916.86 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS FOR POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Postmaster General, submitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for the Post Office Department for the quarter ending September 30, 1943 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were presented and referred as indicated:

By Mr. WHITE:

The petition of Floyd Poland and sundry other citizens of Round Pond, Maine, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition, numerous signed, by members of the First Christian Church, of Ottawa, Kans., praying for the adoption of measures to protect members of the armed forces from vices around training camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A petition signed by members of the Woodland Methodist Church, of Wichita, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

A resolution adopted at Detroit, Mich., by the executive board of the Dairy, Bakery,